PUBLIC SPEAKING FOR BUSINESSMEN

PUBLIC SPEAKING FOR BUSINESSMEN

by

WILLIAM G. HOFFMAN

THIRD EDITION

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

NEW YORK TORONTO LONDON

1949

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

It is more than a quarter of a century since "Public Speaking for Businessmen" was first published. It was revised in 1931 and continued its career as a popular text through the depression, the Second World War, and the present dubious moment of the atomic age. This third edition seems like a reluctant admission that the timeless principles of public speaking may profit by new applications, a new dress, a new look at a reeling world that is trying to talk itself out of final catastrophe.

The strong, silent man is an ideal, and if he is ever found, the reporters will insist on his making a speech to tell us how he got that way. Perhaps, as Carlyle maintained, talk is the curse of the world, but we have suddenly realized that while men are talking they are not fighting. The cold war could be worse.

It is an old story that a democracy—or any other form of government—can prosper only as its problems and conflicts are aired and resolved by discussion. And the same may be said for business and every other activity of our complex social structure. What to say and how to say it are always fundamental and demanding questions. As for the still, small voice, it may find expression in the silences speakers so often forget.

We learn everything through example, precept, and practice. We see an operation, have it explained, try it ourselves under direction and supervision. We gradually get the principles, practice, and proficiency. Improved details of operation give confidence, economy, and dispatch.

The same is true of public speaking. A textbook can be a helpful guide and support. There are questions of thought, language, voice, and bearing. There are matters of taste, selection, emphasis, organization, of sound understanding of speaker-audience relationships. There are elements of "showmanship," of the art of holding attention, which few speakers acquire by practice alone. Practice makes perfect, but it also makes permanent some bad habits and bad speaking.

This new edition of "Public Speaking for Businessmen" has nineteen chapters; the second had twelve. Old chapters have been revised and new ones added to bring the book up to the present "climate of opinion." Speeches, principles, illustrations, assignments, topics for talks, all touch our common experiences and interests and encourage unself-conscious, practical, stimulating talk.

Like the previous editions, this book is written on the proposition that the whole man speaks. No bag of tricks or superficial devices will serve. Character, education, personality, enterprise, the integration of experience and study will be heard, or their absence noted. No man on the platform can hide himself. Francis Bacon, back in Shakespeare's day, expressed it in part when he said, "Men's thoughts are much according to their inclination, their discourse and speeches according to their learning and infused opinions."

WILLIAM G. HOFFMAN

BOSTON, MASS.
August, 1949

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The purpose of this book is to illustrate the principles of public speaking in the more practical and familiar types of address that prevail today. Timeliness is a distinguishing factor in the effective speech. The good speaker fashions his talk to meet present, immediate, and temporary interests that arise from a unique combination of audience and occasion. For this reason few speeches have permanent value. Most of them are naturally too local and restricted in subject matter and appeal to be printed, and those that are published are often disappointing because they lack the necessary energy and emphasis of the speaker's voice and bearing.

The political, forensic, and oratorical types of a generation ago are, as a rule, comparatively remote in content and style. They furnish few directly helpful suggestions, and are rather discouraging to the man who must talk about clothing, machinery, taxes, or sales campaigns. The best speeches of all ages can, of course, make important contributions to the general culture of the student, and a liberal education is of decided advantage to every speaker. The speech is inevitably a reflection of the man. This book stresses in discussion and assignments the need of enriching and developing the whole mind. But it is written on the assumption that the ideal speech, even when it is concerned with the generalities of life and character, is practical in purpose and technical in means. The public speaker must have a vocational skill. He must take his audiences as he finds them and hit a given target with the first shot. He cannot compose a speech as whim or earnest conviction dictate, and send it about the country in a book until it finds congenial readers. He must be steeped in the best methods and devices of current practice.

The speaker must make his own speeches. Memorizing and rehearsing well-known speeches not only puts off the real business of the student but is frequently harmful. It is exhibitional, instead of practical and communicative. The prize declaimer may become a good actor or

reciter; he less easily attains success in public speaking. The incidental benefits of declamation—enunciation and pronunciation, voice and vocabulary building—may be more economically and wholesomely gained by earnest, intelligent practice in reading aloud.

This text is intended not only for executives and others already active in business, but for classes of college grade. The assignments have been used by the writer for several years to encourage self-reliance and variety of effort. They meet every common situation for the speaker on business or other topics. There are many exercises in cooperative leadership, in arranging meetings and planning programs, in finding and adapting live subjects for talk. The common aim is to generate self-activity in thought and action. Students pride themselves in meeting this test like men and not like irresponsible school boys. They rarely fail to do the work assigned by a chairman or a committee in the execution of a class enterprise.

Confident, intelligent practice is the chief means of developing speakers. The instructor will do well, at first, to overlook some of the individual crudities in speech and manner. He can afford to praise what is good and limit his criticism, for the time being, to the availability of the subject and the details of selection and preparation. At the close of the session he may discuss the more obvious and characteristic defects.

The student must early acquire a sense of reality in his study. He must get the habit of seeing the class as a real audience to be informed, inspired, or entertained. The young man who memorizes a passage from a newspaper or book and recites his lesson, should be kindly but firmly awakened from his abstraction by questions designed to make him think actively and talk extemporaneously.

The sequence of chapters and assignments need not be rigidly followed. Classes and conditions naturally vary. But the writer hopes that instructors will find this a usable practice book in answering the question, "What shall I give them next?"

WILLIAM G. HOFFMAN.

BOSTON, MASS.,
September, 1923.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Every book on public speaking owes a great deal to the illustrations and examples afforded by many fine speakers. Names are naturally given with quotations, but the reader should be fully aware of how much these illuminating remarks may add to the fuller understanding of basic principles of speech.

I wish to make special acknowledgment to *Vital Speeches of the Day.* It is an important magazine for all teachers and students in the field of public speaking. Two exceptionally interesting talks published in *Vital Speeches* are reprinted by permission in this book. They are "Partners for Peace," by Eric A. Johnston; and "The Bases of Our National Strength," by David E. Lilienthal.

Talks, "a quarterly digest of addresses presented in the public interest by the Columbia network," is very helpful in the study of radio speeches. By courtesy of the editor, this book quotes paragraphs from "Give One Day," by Chester Bowles; and "An Orange," by David Schoenbrun.

Paul Garrett, Vice-President of General Motors Corporation, kindly allows the reprinting of his address: "If I Had Your Chance."

William G. Hoffman

CONTENTS

LIST OF SPEECHES

Short Radio Talks

CHAPTER I

THE RIGHT APPROACH

Colleges of business administration naturally try to improve their courses and methods of instruction. They make inquiries, send questionnaires to businessmen. "What else can we do," they ask, "to prepare young men and women for business careers?" And the answers are generally something like this:

"Give your students more training in English and public speaking. So many of your graduates don't sound like college men. They don't talk well. They don't impress people favorably. They haven't the maturity and poise we expected."

This business-opinion poll is no doubt disconcerting and deflating to some deans and presidents. Nothing new about it. Same old complaint. No constructive suggestions for making bigger and better businessmen.

It took the war and the service courses in communication skills to rediscover the fundamental values in speech training, values almost buried under the scoffing epithets: declamation, elocution, exhibitionism, histrionics, and other semantic sophistries that served to conceal serious inadequacies. A few remarks made over two hundred years ago may now be reread with a bit more patience.

Lord Chesterfield was disturbed because his nineteen-year-old son was shy and awkward. He sent him to France with a tutor and wrote him a good many letters of advice, which, like most advice, did not function very noticeably. One of his favorite themes was public speaking. In a letter dated August, 1741, he said:

It is certain that, by study and application, every man can make himself a pretty good Orator; eloquence depending upon observation and care. Every

> man, if he pleases, may chuse good words instead of bad ones, may speak properly instead of improperly, may be clear and perspicuous in his recitals, instead of dark and muddy; he may have grace instead of awkwardness in his motions and gestures; and, in short, he may be a very agreeable, instead of a very disagreeable speaker, if he will take care and pains. And surely it is very well worth while to take a great deal of pains to excel other men in that particular article in which they excel beasts.

The words *orator* and *eloquence* are in some disrepute today. They connote the windbaggery of politics or the solemn fustian of anniversaries, but Chesterfield had in mind a sensible and modest kind of speaking. He was a man of humor and good taste.

Eloquence is still the test of a good speech. Webster, to be sure, defines it, in part, as "lofty, noble, or impassioned utterance." That sounds a bit too lofty for most of us, but he goes on to say that it is "complete fusion of thought or feeling with verbal expression." He closes the definition by describing eloquence as "discourse characterized by force, art, and persuasiveness." And that is the very thing that manuals of advertising, business-letter writing, salesmanship, and public speaking try to teach.

However we look at it, public speaking is more and more of personal concern to the ambitious or successful businessman. It is no longer merely the professional art of lawyers, preachers, teachers, and entertainers. It is an art of amateurs who need a little professional understanding. The executive who cannot speak with authority and skill in a conference, before a group of associates or a board of directors, at a dinner or convention is failing in a major responsibility. He is unable to get a satisfactory hearing for needed changes and policies, or he is missing opportunities for expanding the good will of his company and of advertising it in a dignified and effective way.

Leaders as Speakers. Leadership must first express itself in speech. One must know how to ask for things, how to explain things, and how to speak persuasively enough to win the active support of others. Doing business is chiefly talking business. Resourcefulness and adaptability in speech may be regarded as essential to success in every occupation.

The remarkable growth of interest in oral English and public speaking is evidence enough that men and women everywhere appreciate this fact. Many expect too much, however, from a few hours of study. Glibness, mere fluency, is of little value. Good speech is founded on good thinking, and the tree of knowledge is not a mushroom growth.

Business is a much more comprehensive matter than it used to be. Politicians wait upon it; domestic and international affairs revolve about it. The business world, directly or indirectly, includes everybody in civilized countries. Business talks are more numerous than any other kind, and the ever-increasing complexity of society will bring its members together more and more for counsel and inspiration. Not long ago it was thought that the printed page would make public speaking almost obsolete, but man is too social and emotional to be satisfied with the silent page alone. He will always need the personal presence and the living voices of leaders to guide and arouse him. Print, pictures, telephone, radio, and television are added uses and pleasures, but they cannot alter the fundamental importance of public speaking. The businessman studies it as a necessity, not as a luxury. He would avoid it if he could, but he recognizes the fact that more and more such evasion will handicap the intelligent conduct of his affairs.

Characteristics of the Business Talk. Public speaking today is less exhibitional and more truly communicative. It lacks the "grand manner" associated with well-known orators, but its greater simplicity may be just as eloquent. The same change in style is noticeable in fiction, drama, acting, and other speech arts. Practicality and realism are the fashion in this day of wider education and industrial expansion. Speaking is apparently easier, a fact which has misled many into wrong conceptions of the basic nature of the art. Indeed, they make no art of it at all. Their speeches retain the diffuseness and lack of studied organization characteristic of conversation. Their language is not accurate and vivid, their voices lack force and distinction, their bearing on the platform is without authority and poise. Art that is long and sometimes laborious is needed to correct these defects.

Plato defined public speaking as the "art of persuading men." We

speak for the same purpose today and need the same tools to accomplish the desired result. Thought, language, voice, and action must coordinate for concentration, clearness, conciseness, and completeness. Problems of selection, arrangement, emphasis, of enunciation, energy, and resonance, are present in the most unpretentious talks. A great deal of thoughtful, intelligent practice is necessary to acquire a confident and ready skill in effectively solving them. The schools of Greece and Rome required the most rigorous course of study for the public speaker. Before the orator was allowed to go before the public he had to gain a sound fundamental knowledge of all the arts and sciences available and had to spend years in the study and practice of his own art. Cicero and Quintilian were philosophers and scholars, the most broadly educated men of their day, and the greatest orators. Their books on public speaking are still the basis of our modern writings on the subject, and much of the filler, too. The same kind of comprehensive training is perhaps not necessary in our time, but the best speakers must still be philosophers and students, cosmopolitan in their interests and accurate and detailed in the knowledge of their subjects and their presentations.

The Conversational Style. Public speaking is commonly described today as "heightened conversation." This is a good definition if the implications in both words are fully understood. A speech should be forthright and sensible, good-humored and enthusiastic—conversation at its best. The conversational idea reminds you that you are talking to a specific audience and with a definite purpose, in much the same way that you would engage in a spirited discussion with an individual. It emphasizes communicativeness, sincerity, and directness. It condemns empty rhetoric, conventional and artificial language.

On Being Natural. But remember that the exhortation to be conversational also has its limitations. It sounds like the futile advice, "Be natural." For most of us to be natural is to be in some measure awkward, slouchy, indistinct, dull, slow, or monotonous. The natural thing is often so inferior that man has to cultivate it and make it artistic—useful and beautiful. In speech we see the whole struggle for civilization

reflected. Compare the grunts of the savage with the highly complex language we speak, the vocabulary of the illiterate with that of the educated man, the meager words and ideas of the child with the equipment of the adult. To be natural is not enough for most men. They need cultivation before they are ready for public appearance. That easy, natural manner that characterizes the work of the best actors and public speakers, and which makes one think that anybody can do it, is simply the highest art—the art that conceals art—and is the fine product, as a rule, of years of study and experience.

Misconceptions. The businessman too often thinks it is only the showy, declamatory, elocutionary speaking that has art. This is usually bad art because it distracts, deflects attention from the purpose and the subject of the speech to the manner, and fails to attain the desired end. But it is almost as serious a mistake to be satisfied with the trite formula: Have something to say and say it. That sounds honest and easy and is responsible for much dull speaking. It is only the trained speaker who combines the critic sense with the creative faculty and who knows whether he has something to say (of interest to his audience) and whether he is saying it (convincingly and persuasively).

The Definition Defined. In addressing an audience the conversational element and attitude must be *heightened*. Heightened means intensified, elevated, exalted. On the platform the speaker is raised to a leadership that demands, for one thing, much greater knowledge of the subject. He should also have skill in deciding what to omit and what to stress, and understanding of the principles of attention, of unity, and variety. In other words, the businessman must realize first of all that public speaking has a technique just as definite and substantial as have salesmanship, advertising, and letter writing. He must seek proficiency through conscious and properly directed effort. He will avoid the casual, slipshod, unprepared manner of ordinary conversation and give his speech the focus and energy of heightened conversation.

Acquiring Confidence. Perhaps this topic should be considered first in every textbook of public speaking because fear so occupies the mind of the average beginner that he cannot pay attention to anything else.

Well, you have just considered the first comforting idea about it. Public speaking is conversational. You think nothing of talking three or four minutes at a time in a little argument in the office or the shop. You may have just returned from a convention and someone asks you what Smith said in his speech about the big sales campaign his firm put over so conspicuously. The details are fresh in your mind and before you know it you are in the midst of a pretty long speech. A few others come into the office and listen. Several clerks from the next office stand at the door. Presently you have an audience of twenty-five, but you don't mind. You are not making a speech. They have asked you for some practical information and you are giving it. If they interrupt with questions, you will answer them and go right on. Indeed, the speeches in Congress are like that. Members rise from their chairs to ask questions or to call attention to some weakness in the argument of the member on the platform.

Now suppose the advertising club of your city wanted to hear about this campaign. They invite you to speak at a luncheon. Perhaps you are a member and may know several of those present. This crowd has the same attitude that your friends in the office had. These people expect nothing from you but a plain, straightforward talk of plans, methods, results, and some idea of how the thing struck you personally. If, when you have finished your dessert, somebody at the other end of the table might call out, "Say, Jim, tell us about that sales campaign of the A.B.C. Company," you could just take that cue, begin, and talk for an hour without any signs of palsy. Instead, you are introduced and rise, as a matter of convenience and courtesy, so that everybody can see and hear you. You may be a trifle ill at ease. You are more conspicuous than you have ever been before. But you go ahead with a story that you are perfectly at home with. You are a bit awkward in speech and manner, but that will get you more good will than a glib and smart performance. Presently you notice that the faces before you are friendly, relaxed, uncritical. They do not think of you as a public speaker or as an exhibition. They have asked you to give them a few facts, quite in-

formally, and you are giving them in a modest, colloquial, and perhaps offhand way.

"Sticks and stones may break my bones," we retorted as children, "but names will never hurt me." We know better now. They do hurt. The name *public speaking* is associated in the mind of many an adult with some terrifying experience of school days. The painful memorizing of some dull and little understood passage from a pompous oration, the fear of forgetting, the heart-stopped feeling when the teacher finally called him to the platform, walking "the last mile" to face the audience, the sight of grinning and mocking faces, the sudden blur, the faint voice, the tremblings legs, the overwhelming sense of failure and humiliation —just to mention them is enough to start the fever and the sweating all over again.

But, as the psychiatrists say, these ogres must be dragged up from the caves of the subconscious and seen, in the open, for what they are. They soon lose their fatal power when exposed to the daylight and the cooler glance in present and changed circumstances.

Looking at the whole thing a little more simply, it is natural for everyone to have a sense of misgiving, of inadequacy, before any new job, especially when it must be tackled alone before a group of people who are present for the sole purpose of watching and listening, and speculating on how well you are doing the job. Only a freak of egotism, a 100 per cent show-off, could face the prospect without qualms, dread —stage fright.

Yet thousands of students, and adults out of school, are speaking comfortably before audiences and making no more of it than putting down a few notes and reminders of what they wish to say. It's part of the day's work, and they take it in stride.

One reason for their new look at public speaking is that they got the right start. They stopped gazing with paralyzing fascination at some glamorous end product of a finished speaker before a great audience and came back to the prosy business of talking matter-of-factly to the small audience of classmates or business associates. They saw at

once that explaining, informing, arguing, or urging a course of action before people who were eager to cooperate in discovering practical solutions is quite different from the nightmare of recitational mumbo jumbo that had harried them whenever they thought of a platform.

Self-consciousness Is Only a Kind of Vanity. This excessive preoccupation about oneself implies a lack of humor. Think of your subject instead of yourself. Look out, not in. Talk to and with your audience, not at it. You may, in a very real sense, converse with it. It replies, even though it does not speak aloud. Its looks and attitudes bespeak approval, indifference, or question. You anticipate queries, objections, difficulties. Your problems in pointing out to your listeners the possibilities of your subject absorb your attention and lead you to active, purposeful concentration and study. This is what the business-letter writer calls the "you attitude." "Keep your mind on the other man" is a slogan of salesmanship.

We may not talk away the fear of the platform altogether, but worse fears have been removed by the power of suggestion. That very human psychologist, William James, in "Talks to Teachers," has a passage that should be deeply engraved in the mind of anyone who cannot "think on his feet." Here it is:

> *Unclamp,* in a word, your intellectual and practical machinery, and let it run free; and the service it will do you will be twice as good. Who are the scholars who get "rattled" in the recitation-room? Those who think of the possibilities of failure and feel the great importance of the act. Who are those who do recite well? Often those who are most indifferent. *Their* ideas reel themselves out of their memory of their own accord.

Relax. One way to confidence, then, is through cultivating objective thought. Get ready calmly and relax. Do not attack your assignment grimly or desperately. The young speaker is often urged to summon his will to the task, to remember what others have done, etc. Reinforce your self-respect by all means, but do not dwell upon it overmuch. You may fail to attend properly to the business you have with the audience. How far would a singer or a ballplayer get if he spent most of his time worrying about the moment of stepping out before his public? Of

course he thinks about it, but with a sense of proportion. He knows that his salvation is in preparation and study and practice, and when he is ready he is eager to go. He discounts his nervousness. He knows that what he has done he can do again, even though he does not do it quite so easily or quickly or skillfully as he hopes to do. Preparation is the mother of confidence. The prepared speaker knows what he is going to say and do.

The Advantage of Fear. The man who lacks any fear of an audience often lacks imagination and sensitiveness. He may not appreciate his responsibility and may be easily satisfied with an indifferent performance. Many great speakers have confessed to nervousness, depression, and fear of failure. They always had a wholesome respect for their audience, and this state of mind drove them to careful preparation for every occasion, great or small.

Diffidence. There are comparatively few persons who are not diffident—afflicted with embarrassment before some person or group, even though they are at ease and freely communicative with others. The professor and the plumber may be dumb in each other's presence in spite of the fact that they are voluble enough elsewhere. The wisest or wittiest man may seem dull among men of different training or experience. He has little to say and is keenly aware of his self-consciousness and futility. There is simply no common ground of interest large enough to promote "shop talk" of comparison, disagreement, question, and narration, whether the talk is of a common occupation or stimulated by common interest in religion, politics, baseball, or fishing.

Diffidence is converted into confidence by an atmosphere of congeniality. Dr. Richard C. Cabot in "What Men Live By" speaks interestingly of this:

> You can "get the jump on" another's diffidence if you shoot into his soul a message of welcome, of encouragement, of faith in his power to do something better than he has yet done. You do not wait for him to show his best. Your impulse of welcome breaks down his reserve, melts his shyness and brings him nearer to the thing that you expect of him. This is mirrored in his face. You see it, and your original faith is reinforced. You follow up the trail of

sparks which you have spied within him; the spirit and exuberance of your quest redoubling in him the fire which you seek.

Diffident Persons Often Good Speakers. This bit of psychology explains the fact that many shy persons are nevertheless excellent public speakers. On the platform they are free of the aggressive or challenging or competing or impatient personalities who press them too closely in conversation. The larger audience is comparatively remote and impersonal, and yet it is near enough to encourage with its attention, sympathy, patience, and approval. The speaker is not hurried or interrupted. The faces about him are kindly, helpful, expectant.

Sympathy between Speaker and Audience. For the same reason public speaking may be more intimate and personal than conversation. Most people are reticent when it comes to talking about the facts and emotions that really govern them. They are afraid of sounding silly or bookish. They fear the jibe or cynical smile.

The author and the public speaker have the time and the means to create moods and attitudes in their readers or audiences. Suspicion and the conventional suppression of feeling are not present to discourage warmth of expression. Conversations in the best plays or novels seem natural enough and absorb us and thrill us with their wisdom or smartness, humor or pathos. If these were actual conversations of real life, they would probably be called stilted or sentimental, affected or impossible.

In the next chapter will be noted the importance of planning and preparing for a definitely visualized audience. There is no distortion of the essential elements of the picture if the speaker imagines his audience to be thoroughly congenial and sympathetic.

Have a Plan. We have not finished with this matter of courage and composure. Going back to your imaginary talk on the convention address, you will probably agree that what kept you going was your thorough preparation. You knew the subject inside out. It had become a part of your own experience. You had a simple arrangement of topics. You jotted them down in the order in which the campaign progressed. You discussed the "prospects" who were to be reached, the way to get

live mailing lists, the newspaper and magazine "copy," the letters and the "follow-ups," the folders that were enclosed, the special offer, the checkup on inquiries, the costs, the sales, the things that might have been done better, the application of the methods to other lines of business. You did not have to think on your feet. You thought in your chair in the office, at home, on the street—anywhere before you mounted the platform. You unraveled the tangled skein of ideas at your leisure.

When Buffon, the scientist, delivered his address on style to the French Academy, he presented the scientist's characteristic point of view —order and system in thinking. He said:

> It is from lack of plan, from lack of reflection on his purpose, that a man of sheer intelligence finds himself embarrassed and does not know at what point to begin to write. ["Or to speak," he might have added.] He perceives, all at the same time, a great number of ideas; and, since he has neither compared them nor subordinated them, nothing leads him to prefer any of them to the others; so he remains in perplexity.

The experienced public speaker is like the experienced salesman. He has a pattern of description, explanation, and argument that is so detailed and definite through reflection and familiarity that his talk is pretty nearly automatic. He seldom has to really think on his feet.

George Herbert Palmer, in "Self-cultivation in English," puts this idea strikingly in advising you to "lean upon your subject." When you have considered your subject enough to give it body and form, it will support you. You can lean on it, stand on it, get behind it, hide in it. "The play's the thing." The audience is absorbed in the story. The actor is absorbed in his part—his message—and the audience forgets him or takes him for granted.

Practice. The best way to overcome the sinking spells that afflict all novices is to speak as often as you can. Remember that most public speakers are made, not born. Speaking is just one more job and we learn how to do it as we learn everything else—by doing it. In every walk of business the man who improves is the man who fights his own cowardice before some new problem or responsibility. His fear shames

him, and with knocking heart and shaking legs he tackles the job to save his self-respect. His excitement and fear of quitting keep him going. Suddenly he becomes calm and finds he has greatly overrated the difficulty and the terror. Presently a new rut of use and habit is grooved, and the man turns to something else to worry about.

Summary. The ABC, then, of promoting confidence on the platform is: (*a*) the conversational, not the exhibitional, attitude toward the audience; (*b*) preparation; (*c*) practice. The opportunities for practice are almost unlimited. Beginning with the small jobs will give you poise and assurance for the larger, more responsible ones. Give short informal talks to the members of your club, fraternity, or other organization. Take part in debating a motion, act as secretary or chairman, speak at a dinner or introduce a guest. Students gain enormously in ease after their first talks. They begin to feel that "there's nothing to it" and often enough fall victims to overconfidence and laziness.

First Assignment. But there is still that first talk—something pretty simple but still carrying some burden of old fears not yet subdued. In the classroom the instructor can give you several choices from which to select a comparatively painless start.

Discussion. The easiest way, for most beginners, is to take part in a discussion or round table on the platform. Being seated among others gives you a sense of support from fellow sufferers in the same boat. You don't have to worry about that organized, sustained speech. If the chairman or leader notices that you seem to be struck dumb, he can always ask you an easy question, like "Do you agree with that, George?" and release a yes or no, with perhaps a reason or two for good measure.

Of course, discussion before public audiences implies preparation, enough study to actually inform, lead, or persuade the listeners. In classes, too, there should be plenty of this superior, well-organized talk (see Chap. 18 when you are ready for that). But if the instructor wishes to start your practice at the first meeting, he may select four or five of you at random to sit round his desk and get going on a topic he has given you. It should be a familiar, somewhat provocative topic—something that will loosen your tongues, something that will induce dis-

agreement and argument or that will at least suggest different points of view. It may be put as a question to focus your attention upon a live issue.

From five to ten minutes may be long enough for one round table at this first meeting. It is advisable to hear every student as soon as possible, and, as the course continues, as often as possible.

Some of the following questions may serve for practice in case you can't think of better ones.

1. Should we have universal military training?
2. Should we have coeducation in this school?
3. Should college fraternities and sororities be abolished?
4. Should billboards be abolished?
5. Should final examinations be abolished?
6. Should government provide scholarships for college?
7. Do we need a city manager?
8. Are small colleges preferable to large colleges?
9. What is personality? How can it be improved?
10. Should a President be elected for a term of six years and for one term only?

Reading to the Class. It is, of course, much easier to face a class with a script to read than it is to deliver a talk. To read well is something else, but the assurance of words all set down for him gives the beginner considerable confidence in standing before an audience, even though he keeps his face buried in his book most of the time. So for his first appearance the student may elect to read aloud. He should still try to interest the class, however, by reading the passage with good sense and spirit. Let him imagine that he is on the air and is trying to make his words sound like real talk. He will hold attention by an easy familiarity with his script, by an unhurried rate of speaking, by intelligent pauses, and by a genuine desire to communicate.

It is not so simple as it sounds. Most speakers talk better than they read. But there is little excuse for the fumbling, mumbling voice which merely suggests that the reader doesn't know what he's reading and is merely going through the motions of a disagreeable task.

Here are a few short passages for practice. Many others in the book will serve as well.

1. Just to show that though I am a conservative I am not a reactionary or a trilobite, I venture the suggestion that it would aid the efficiency of the executive and center his energy and attention and that of his subordinates in the latter part of his administration upon what is a purely disinterested public service if he were made ineligible after serving one term of six years either to a succeeding or a non-consecutive term.

I am a little specific in this matter, because it seems necessary to be so in order to be understood. I don't care how unambitious or modest a President is; I don't care how determined he is that he himself will not secure his renomination (and there are very few, indeed, who go to that extent), still his subordinates equally interested with him in his re election will, whenever they have the opportunity, exert their influence and divide their time between the public service and the effort to secure their chief's renomination and re-election.

It is difficult to prevent the whole Administration from losing a part of its effectiveness for the public good by this diversion to political effort for at least a year of the four of each administration. Were this made impossible by law, I can see no reason why the energy of the President and that of all his subordinates might not be directed rather to making a great record of efficiency in the first and only term than in seeking a second term for that purpose.

Four years is rather a short time to work out great governmental policies. Six years is better.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.

2. I have read in the textbooks of political economy about enlightened selfishness. I have never seen any selfishness that was enlightened. Selfishness is a state of utter darkness, it is a state of utter blindness, and if men could only see that generosity and public service are profitable, then the millennium would come along faster than it is coming. What we are seeking, as I just now said, is a programme, but not a programme of warfare, not a programme of hostilities even; we are not seeking that poor, negative, pale, colorless thing called a truce; we are not seeking a peace which is a mere holding off of the action of passion. We are seeking the kind of peace which brings co-operation, which brings independence, which brings sympathies, which brings the release of all the handsomer motives of humanity. We are seeking accommodation. Every act, therefore, of public men and of private men, should have as its object to withdraw the veil from men's eyes, so that they can see their

own affairs in the term of the neighborhood, in the terms of the community, in the terms of the life of the nation itself. When we see things in that vision, we shall have begun to see our way amidst the perplexities of modern business, and we shall then have not only a programme of action, but a programme of adjustment.

WOODROW WILSON.

3. I am asked to speak tonight to the toast, "The Day We Celebrate." And here again I am handicapped because I cannot employ the rhetorical expedients which Mr. Edward Everett did on one of the anniversaries of Lexington and Concord. I remember once asking the late Senator Hoar whether the story was true as I had originally heard it from Doctor William H. Furness. He told me it was true. The story was that Edward Everett, having to deliver a formal oration on the battle of Lexington and Concord, before the time of delivering the oration asked whether there were any survivors of the battle in the neighborhood, and he was told that somewhere in the rural districts there happened to be two nonagenarians who had been among the embattled farmers. He sought them and then said, "I want you to come to the exercises, and when I reach a certain apostrophe to the survivors of the battle, I want you to arise." And they said they would. When he came to that part in his address, and swelling with all the glory of his oratory, said: "And you survivors of Lexington and Concord," the two gentlemen arose upon their cue. And then he said to them, "Venerable sirs, be seated; it is I that should stand in your presence." After the speaking was over one of these survivors of the battle turned to the other and said, "I don't know what was the matter with Squire Everett, first he told us to stand up and then he told us to sit down."

JAMES M. BECK.

4. There is one virtue, I am sure, in after-dinner oratory, and that is brevity; and as to that I am reminded of a story. The Lord Chief Justice has told you what are the ingredients of after-dinner oratory. They are the joke, the quotation, and the platitude; and the successful platitude, in my judgment, requires a very high order of genius. I believe that I have not given you a quotation, but I am reminded of something which I heard when very young —the story of a clergyman in America. He was preaching at a camp meeting, and he was preaching on the miracle of Joshua, and he began his sermon with

this sentence: "My hearers, there are three motions of the sun. The first is the straightforward or direct motion of the sun; the second is the retrogade or backward motion of the sun; and the third is the motion mentioned in our text—'the sun stood still.' "

Now, gentlemen, I don't know whether you see the application of this story—I hope you do. The after-dinner orator at first begins and goes straight ahead—that is the straightforward motion of the sun. Next he goes back and begins to repeat himself—that is the backward motion of the sun. At least he has the good sense to bring himself to the end, and that is the motion mentioned in our text, as the sun stood still.

JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

5. There is a time in every man's education when he arrives at the conviction that envy is ignorance; that imitation is suicide; that he must take himself for better, for worse, as his portion; that though the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through his toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given to him to till. The power which resides in him is new in nature, and none but he knows what that is which he can do: nor does he know until he has tried . . . We but half express ourselves, and are ashamed of that divine idea which each of us represents. It may be safely trusted as proportionate and of good issues, so it be faithfully imparted, but God will not have His work made manifest by cowards. A man is relieved and gay when he has put his heart into his work and done his best; but what he has said and done otherwise shall give him no peace. It is a deliverance which does not deliver. In the attempt his genius deserts him; no muse befriends; no invention, no hope.

Trust thyself: every heart vibrates to that iron string. Accept the place the divine providence has found for you, the society of your contemporaries, the connection of events. Great men have always done so, and confided themselves childlike to the genius of their age, betraying their perception that the eternal was stirring at their heart, working through their hands, predominating in all their being. And we are now men, and must accept in the highest mind the same transcendent destiny; and not minors and invalids in a protected corner, not cowards fleeing before a revolution, but guides, redeemers and benefactors, obeying the Almighty effort and advancing on Chaos and the Dark.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

Speaking from Experience. Many students like to speak about what they've seen and done—about trips, places, or exciting, embarrassing, or comic incidents they have been through. They like to talk about their vacations, their work, their school, their plans for the future. They narrate these personal experiences with spontaneous zest and often with considerable interest for the listeners. At any rate, such incidents are good material for the beginning speaker because he is in little fear of forgetting what he wants to say. He is more at ease than with something from books or magazines. He may speak on one of the following topics or something suggested by them.

1. A Night Off
2. Vacation Vagaries
3. One More about the War
4. I Go to the Circus
5. I Can Cook
6. Rookie
7. What I Learned from the Pro
8. A Look at Basketball
9. Night Baseball
10. I Had to Travel
11. It's a Good Sport
12. Any Way You Look at It
13. Part-time Job
14. Parley with the Police
15. I Learn Something at College

Speaking from Reading. On the other hand is the student who can't capitalize on that sort of experience. He complains that nothing worth talking about ever happens to him. Maybe he's right, or maybe just bashful. Every speaker should, however, learn to observe, to reflect upon the commonplace things we all share equally, and to use them effectively in talks. More of that later.

But you have probably felt at times that you would be less self-conscious if you talked about something you have read or heard. You will naturally be more confident with what you have found easy and enjoyable. A subject in this book may stir you to speak, or a maga-

zine article may have furnished you with a stock of ideas you can reel off with pleasure. If nothing better occurs to you, make a few comments on one of these items.

1. Singing Commercials
2. Radio Comics
3. An Occupation That Looks Good to Me
4. Juvenile Delinquency
5. A Speaker I Like
6. Soil Conservation
7. Rain Makers
8. The New Cars
9. Veterans at School
10. Aptitude Tests
11. How I Read a Newspaper
12. Oil or Coal?
13. Something New in Housing
14. A Best Seller
15. The Art of Commuting
16. Taxes on Business
17. The High Cost of Tariffs
18. Old-age Pensions
19. Daylight Saving
20. Better Farming
21. The Business Cycle
22. The Cost of Crime
23. Getting a Job
24. The Better Business Bureau
25. The Merchant Marine
26. Is Thrift Unsound?
27. Small Town
28. New Frontiers
29. Making Music
30. What's the Matter with the Movies?

CHAPTER II

CHOOSING THE SUBJECT

What to talk about is no problem at all to the specialist in a field of business. He is invited to give practical information, to show how to do the job better, to help his listeners make more money. He may speak the same piece wherever he goes.

But even he will soon discover that he's got to "change his act" from time to time. What he is offering is not what the audience expected or hoped for. They weren't in the mood for technical explanations or any kind of "useful" information. They wanted inspiration, exhilaration, excitement, humor, entertainment. The occasion just wasn't appropriate for the "good old line."

Study the Speech Triangle. Before you choose the subject or plan the speech, you must see the whole situation, the triangle made by yourself, the audience, and the occasion. Naturally you will search your own mind for the material of the talk, but your real work is to cut and fit it to specifications, and these are furnished by your prospective listeners and the occasion that brings them together. So you must visualize the scene much as a playwright does. Who are the audience? How many? Why are they here? How long do they expect you to speak? Who else is to speak? Who will introduce you? Go up and down and around the triangle until you get the needed clues and directions. Many a speech that looks good at home is only a misfit and a failure because the speaker is, in a psychological sense, a unitarian instead of a trinitarian. He is preoccupied with one angle, himself, and overlooks the other two.

Find the Purpose of Speaking. You cannot select a subject until you have made this survey. As Professor Genung has said, "Seek the object before you choose the subject." There is always an object, a pur-

pose, in speaking, and talk is often poor because the speaker has not discovered the appropriate one. The five general purposes or ends of speech have been classified as (1) *to inform;* (2) *to impress;* (3) *to convince, or win belief;* (4) *to persuade, or induce action;* (5) *to entertain.* These are not merely academic distinctions. You will go astray pretty quickly if you cannot make up your mind which of these purposes or attitudes you will take toward your audience. Not that you must confine yourself to one purpose or be always aware that you are going from one to another. But there is a dominant purpose. The instructor's purpose, for instance, is *to inform.* He will, if he is an interesting, imaginative speaker, often impress and entertain, and these ends may be the dominant purposes of occasional lectures, but his course is planned with the dominant purpose to inform. The speaker in a conference or at a convention often talks chiefly to inform, but he makes a fatal error if his audience is already informed or does not care to be informed. It may be that his main purpose should be to *persuade,* to get the audience to do something about the familiar facts. Nothing is duller or more pointless than information that listeners have no use for. It may be the speaker's purpose to show that they actually do have a use for the facts; that is, he will try to *impress* them and *convince* them.

If an occasion is a birthday or an anniversary, your subject is clearly limited to what is appropriate to the particular occasion. If the audience has gathered to do tribute to Washington, you will not satisfy with an account of your trip to Madagascar. But you are still further limited by this principle of general aims or ends. Shall you try to *inform* the audience about the life of Washington? This will do if you know a great deal more about Washington than most speakers. The usual result of this aim is a stale rehash of kindergarten facts. You will be more likely to succeed if your purpose is to *impress* your listeners, let us say, with his heroism or statesmanship or patience; or to *convince* them of the wisdom of his isolation policy; or to *persuade* them to think cheerfully about, and to work actively for, one's community or country, as Washington did, in spite of jealousy, stupidity, and meanness.

By taking one point of view or another you are trying to make

Washington vital to that audience, to link him in some way with the business and desires of every man and woman present. You anticipate the indifferent (and most listeners are just that) or the cynical or dull by challenging their implied question: "What is there in all this for me?"

So your declared topic "Washington" may be only a starting point for a practical discussion of perplexing strikes or taxation or unemployment. It is best on these "harmony" occasions, however, to avoid anything that may arouse prejudice, rancor, or strong opposition, because this would defeat your purpose of inspiring an audience to kindlier and more loyal activity through the contemplation of a noble career.

Good Use of the Occasion. A senior at Amherst, P. William Conrad, speaking at the commencement exercises, gives us a very pertinent illustration of thoughtful looking about for a subject. His opening remarks show us the method of his search:

I want each of you to imagine for a moment the problem with which you are confronted when you are offered the opportunity of standing before this audience and speaking for ten minutes on any subject under the sun.

"What under the sun can I talk about?" you ask yourself.

You are a little afraid of being serious, for the solemnity and ponderous wisdom of the senior are traditional and he is sensitive to ridicule on that point and feels in honor bound to give it the lie on every possible occasion. But if you are not to be serious then you must be witty, and to be witty for ten minutes is in itself a serious matter and well beyond the powers of most of us. So you decide that for once you will have to be serious.

But that is only the matter of attitude. The subject is yet to be conjured up. For you cannot merely be serious—you have to be serious about something. So you begin searching around in your mind for something that you would like to talk about. And you reject this because your classmates would not be interested. And you reject that because it would be of interest only to your classmates and not to their parents. And you reject this—and you reject that. And gradually it is brought to your attention that this audience that you are to speak to is a peculiar audience. There are two separate and distinct parts to it, and you cannot talk to both parts in the same way—not on the subjects

that you would really like to talk about. So you look into the matter. And you find out something. What you find is not new. It is as old as the human race. It has been ever since there have been mothers, and fathers, and children. It is not new, but it is deeply significant; and each generation has to learn it for itself; and most generations have to learn it twice—once when they are children and once (because they have forgotten it again) when their children are children. And the first time they learn it, it hurts. And the second learning is sometimes an agony almost too great to be borne.

I want to talk about this thing for the few minutes that I have because I believe it is of vital importance to every human being as a human being, and because I believe that a right understanding of it is of very great significance to the problems on which this college, perhaps more than any other, has been doing intelligent constructive work—the problems of education, the passing on of what the race has found worth while from generation to generation.

I want to speak chiefly to you mothers and fathers who have come to see us, your children, complete our formal education. We who are graduating have had four years in which to talk with each other, but this is the first and last time that we may speak to you in a body. And so, as one of your children, I want to tell you what I think about this gulf which has opened between us —that is always between generation and generation. I want to tell you what I think that gulf has to do with education and what education has to do with it.

Anticipate the Mood. The occasion does not always suggest an available topic. If you are to talk at a dinner of your class, club, or fellow employees, you will look for means to effect your general purpose of entertainment. This includes more than witticisms or "funny" stories. You are entertaining when you hold the attention agreeably with a serious subject, when you impress or persuade. If you do not quite manage that, you can at least fall in with the mood of your audience through a light, concise and pointed treatment of your topic. Avoid the lifeless, rambling generalities that merely kill time and interest. Nobody wants a review of the association's history or extended talk about the virtues of fraternalism. Good-fellowship and sentiment are desirable, but merely talking about them will not create them. They are the by-products of cheerful talk on vital and refreshing ideas.

You need not worry about the bright quips you envy in others. A short talk on a specific situation that concerns your fellows, a problem, a solution, a plea for action on the part of the members, is always acceptable. If you are the speaker of the evening, you may speak at greater length, on almost any subject, provided it is not gloomy or acidly argumentative or technical. It may be "Railroad Rates," "The City Dock," "Facts in the Lumber Business," "Latin-America Trade Relations," or any other subject which you have experienced and to which you have given study and reflection.

The speeches of Chauncey M. Depew are well worth studying in regard to the choice of a subject. He spoke at every conceivable kind of dinner or situation. He talked to New England, Dutch, and Irish societies, to the graduates of medical, religious, and engineering schools, and to tramps. He welcomed famous visitors, gave loving cups, laid cornerstones, and unveiled a statue to himself. In all this variety his formula was simple. He began with a few words of greeting and understanding; he referred briefly to any stirring incident associated with the occasion; he told stories, not very often humorous or witty but significant and illustrative, anecdotes, bits from the lives of famous persons or places; and he concluded with a word for the future, a congratulation, or a paragraph that touched the good will or generosity of the group. He never forgot the nature of his audience and he always looked for the story, the narrative.

Before a Class. Students in public-speaking classes have, as a rule, only one audience. No matter how often they speak, no matter how many occasions they may invent, the same rather indifferent faces look up at them. There is not much chance to dress up the old speech or the old joke. The student is worse off than the preacher because the latter, although similarly handicapped, has the pulpit to himself. But when every student has to hear every other student, he soon begins to feel that there is no fresh material left. Yet this condition of his practice should be of more value than any other. Charles James Fox, probably the greatest debater in the history of the British Parliament, attributed his skill to the fact that he rose to speak on some motion every

time he was present. He learned how to listen, how to reason, how to discover the real issues in questions, and how to say the decisive words about them. The student who says he cannot find a subject spends too much time looking for news, facts, information, something that he can reproduce from a newspaper or a magazine. Reading is, of course, a necessary part of the speaker's training, and sometimes of his special preparation, but information of itself is seldom appreciated by an audience. Reciting a lesson can never pass for a speech. Interpretation, illumination, comment, speculation, experience, must edit and reshape everything the speaker takes from his observation and study. A headline may be the text for a good ten-minute talk. The speech of another student should give abundant cues and clues. The mind must be curious, practical, interested. A book full of subjects and attractive titles may yield astonishingly few suggestions if the attention is listless or the background of reading and experience meager. Invention and resourcefulness are best acquired by a persistent reference to the common and commonplace things about one. The courses of study ought to furnish innumerable questions for discussion. History, science, economics, psychology, sociology, politics, business, art, and literature bristle with live material of importance to everybody. If the student takes them as a necessary bore, he naturally will see nothing in them for a speech. The most interesting subjects are probably the oldest. The conflicts between the poor and the rich, the young and the old, the conservatives and the radicals, the ins and the outs, the problems of getting ahead in the world, the craving for a richer life, were the staple topics of the ancients and they will be vital to the end of the world.

But every young man has a lively interest in something or somebody. Current events, prominent writers or politicians, the latest popular book or play, the social life about him, experiences on the farm, "on the road," or in the factory, a vacation trip, what the college needs, are all subjects of attractive possibilities.

The Common Situation. Out of the classroom a speaker rarely has any trouble in finding a subject. Usually the occasion suggests at once

the limited range of subjects that are appropriate. If there is nothing definite in the occasion and one is asked to speak on "anything," it is because he is or has been closely connected with the group he is to address, or because he has achieved success in some occupation. In the one case the subjects will be prompted by mutual experience. Greeting, carefully selected reminiscence, changes, problems solved and still to be solved, tentative solutions, a bit of prophecy or warning, a closing word of good cheer, and the thing is done.

If you are invited to speak because you know something about marketing, manufacturing, or anything else, your real problem is that of selecting details that can be made important and stimulating to vour audience.

As a rule, little reading is necessary for a particular speech. Details may be verified, a few subtopics amplified, but the subject and content, to be successful, must be drawn from familiar, well-tested reading and experience. A practical speech is always reminiscent, a part of your inner life, "where you live," not the result of a few days' cramming.

Live Your Subject. Phillips Brooks used to say he had only one sermon. He meant that he told over and over again the story of the better life, expounded it and tried to live it himself. There is one great secret of effective speech making: Live your subject. Carlyle said a man cannot write a poem until he lives a poem. You must experience your subject as one is said to "experience" religion. You do not "know" it until you "realize" it, until it is real to you through vivid thinking, contact, and familiarity. You cannot talk authoritatively or convincingly about life in foxholes unless you have lived it, or about what the workingman wants unless you are one or have been one and can recall the experience with sympathetic imagination. This does not mean that you cannot talk about Napoleon or Lincoln because you did not meet them in person. It means that you can talk about them only when your reading has so interested you that you recreate them and live with them in the camp, in the council room, in the home, in temptation, in despair, in weakness, triumph, or defeat.

Making a Subject Appropriate. It is not the subject, but the failure

to adapt it to the audience, that accounts for so much poor speaking. A banker may talk well about investments, taxes, or foreign trade, but he should not give the same speech to high-school pupils, farmers, mechanics, and manufacturers. The groups differ greatly from one another in experience and interests. "Foreign Trade" is a good subject for all of them, but all ask for different pictures. A different set of questions and answers must be drawn up for each. The boy is interested in the romance, the adventure of the business, and sees in it opportunities for good jobs; the speaker must answer his eager inquiries. The farmer looks for a chance to sell his surplus wheat and corn. The mechanic asks whether there is an outlet for overproduction in typewriters or radios. He is always interested in details that ensure plenty of work at good wages. The manufacturer is puzzled by the complexities of introducing his product to a foreign people. He wants to know about agents, advertising mediums, competition, costs of transportation, tariffs, packing, and the like.

It seems obvious to say that the talk for manufacturers will not "go" as well before farmers or high-school boys, but that is the kind of blunder often made by speakers. They are aiming at no one in particular and their random shots fail to strike the interest of their listeners.

But this is not the worst fault. Many speakers apparently have no faith at all in human intelligence. They dislike to give their audiences credit for knowing anything. A college student will vigorously announce that "this college needs a new athletic field" and will put his audience to sleep with the dull recital of matter that has been common gossip for years. His proper theme, where to find a suitable and available location and how to raise the funds for the project, he never mentions.

Men supposedly expert in public affairs will retell what everybody has read in newspaper headlines. A brief review may be necessary to introduce something else. It may serve as preliminary explanation, but no amount of solemn asseveration can convert it into information.

"Put yourself in his place" is everywhere the first rule of action in dealing with your fellows. You speak to get a specific reaction. You in-

stinctively adjust your conversation in some measure to the varying temperaments and mental contents of your acquaintances. Why is it that the more obvious differences in audiences are so frequently overlooked—as well as the obviously common knowledge they share with us? Chiefly because the speaker does not think of his audience at all during his preparation—except with fear. His attention is misdirected by the trying exhibition he is about to make and by his absorbing desire to go through it as respectably as possible. The conversational attitude is absent. He has no distinct picture of any individual whom he is to address and who is constantly asking questions which the speech must answer. George M. Cohan used to say that he wrote his plays for the approval of the boy in the gallery. That boy was always looking over Cohan's shoulder, criticizing ideas, words, scenes, and climaxes. As you plan, and write and reflect, ask yourself how much your audience knows of this subject. If it is a very familiar one, show it in a new light, give new illustrations, or draw different conclusions.

In Short. Let the audience and the occasion suggest your topic. That topic may not always seem to have anything to do with your business qualifications, but it may concern you very closely as a person. You should welcome the chance to commune and confer with others on a subject of general interest, to sympathize, to encourage, to join in praise, to speak simply and briefly at a dinner party, to learn to be "at home" as a human being as well as an encyclopedia.

Before you begin the actual preparation of your speech, you should consider certain guides that will help you to focus more accurately on audience interests. These will be discussed in the next chapter.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. You are invited to speak at an assembly of the grammar school from which you graduated. Give three subjects that you might discuss at such a meeting.

II. You are to address a convention of students from many colleges. What will you talk about?

III. You are to address a football rally. How can you avoid being trite or tiresome?

IV. You are to make a speech before the Rotarians of your home town. What subjects seem most vital?

V. You are to speak at a class dinner. On what topics?

VI. Suppose you were the president of a fraternity chapter. What subjects or points of view would you develop in welcoming a national convention to be held in your city or college?

VII. You are going to speak to the men's club of your church. On what subject?

VIII. You are asked to present a gift to the retiring president of your society. What specific idea could you expand? Would you treat it humorously or sentimentally or both?

IX. You are a candidate for the class presidency. How can you avoid merely saying, in effect: "Vote for me"? What matters could you discuss to show indirectly your qualifications for the honor?

X. Speak on one of the following topics:

1. Getting Ahead
2. Your Money's Worth
3. Causes of Failure
4. Women in Business
5. The Golden Rule in Business
6. A Man without a Country
7. Canadian Industries and Resources
8. The Keeping of Records
9. College Football
10. Problems of Puerto Rico
11. How to Keep Free Enterprise Free
12. Don't Be a Typical College Man
13. The Iron Curtain
14. Charlie McCarthy
15. My Favorite Detective
16. The Flow of Capital
17. Margarine versus Butter
18. Hitchhiking
19. No Other Cigarette Can Say That

20. Second Guessing
21. Amvets
22. New Uses for Glass
23. Ferry Ride
24. War Memoirs
25. Take It or Leave It

CHAPTER III

AIMING AT THE VITAL WANTS

The advertiser and the salesman are familiar with much of what will be said here, and they use it with a calculated and practiced skill. Their customers may be dimly aware of the techniques by which they are beguiled but they seldom arrive at an awareness that makes them cynical or resistant. They rarely cry out, like Hamlet to Guildenstern:

> You would play upon me; you would seem to know my stops; you would pluck out the heart of my mystery; you would sound me from my lowest note to the top of my compass—'Sblood, do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe?

As a student of business you know that there are a number of universal wants, a number of primal urges, in every individual. You know, further, that he will be more likely to pay attention and respond favorably when he is reached through one or more of these "impelling motives." He may be "played upon" in a sense, but most appeals in business are legitimate and honest. In politics—well, you have seen how Hitler and Goebbels sold an intelligent people the most destructive program in the history of the world by playing deliberately, forcefully, unceasingly, upon well-known wants.

There is no secret about all this. Your readings in elementary psychology remind you that everybody is a bundle of desires mostly selfish, often unselfish. These have been classified according to their degree of dominance in the ego.

Self-preservation. First on every list is self-preservation. Man is actively concerned, his whole life long, with preserving himself from death, injury, illness, and loss of his business, money, and property. These feelings of anxiety become deeper and more extensive. They

include his alter egos—his family and other loved ones. At the bottom of all trouble is fear. When President Roosevelt was first inaugurated, in the midst of the depression, he said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," and he tried to allay it by assuring his nation-wide audience that their deposits in savings banks were really safe, that the government would provide jobs, and that no one would be without food and shelter. This was, in fact, the most inspirational of all inaugural addresses because it did literally inspire millions of people with renewed hope and courage to face their immediate and overwhelming misfortunes.

Of course, the President's speech problem was, in one respect, easier to discover than yours may ever be. He knew just what everybody fiercely wanted. The whole country had been shouting it and wanted no political evasions or sweet literary by-passing. He knew exactly what he had to shoot at.

Fear. The appeal to fear is still the most common. Is there any bigger business than insurance? How often doctors and dentists wish they could convert themselves into mass production. Vitamin pills, reducing diets, four-out-of-five cures work through the scare nerves.

Business has its own special fears—the fear of competition, although it loves free enterprise; the fear of taxes, of labor unions, of Communism; the fear of shortages, of excessive inventory; the fear of not increasing efficiency; the fear of not getting the right young men to replace the oldsters.

Everywhere, the politicians are discovering, protection and security are as urgently wanted as freedom and free enterprise.

"Peace of Mind," by Rabbi Joshua Liebman, revealed, in its great popularity, the deep-seated fears, other than economic and political, that haunt so many individuals and so many audiences. Understanding, compassion, intelligent, sincere talk about the doubts and despairs of the human race will always get a hearing.

Profit. But these reflections are somewhat depressing and apply, perhaps, chiefly to older, disillusioned folk. Man has an eager energy, too. He is acquisitive and wants to have and to own many things. You can

show him how to make money, how to invest it, how to make a better living. You can show businessmen what their competitors are doing, show ways of improving their products, of cutting down their overhead, of bettering distribution, of extending publicity and good will—anything that will bring bigger profits.

Ambition sleeps or stirs in many breasts. It awaits encouraging and practical advice. Young people, especially, want to be somebody, do things, and "go places." They are eager to work, to study, to sacrifice, to give that fresh young strength generously in worthy causes. They are often disappointed with the petty round of things they do in business and impatient with their lack of speedy promotion. But today the average employee's hours are so short that he has enough spare time to study and make a career nearer his heart's desire. Think of the inventors, artists, and writers who, in other days, after long and tiring hours at the bench or in the office, worked at the things they wanted most to do. You can interest many an audience, besides gardeners, in improving their lot.

The Desire to "Belong." The world is full of lonely and frustrated persons. They feel out of things. Nobody notices them. They want to win friends and influence people. Hitler knew how to exploit this want for his own purposes. Everyone, from childhood up, had to belong to one or more of his joy and health and love-of-fatherland *gesellschafte*. He encouraged uniforms and badges of honor. At least all Germans could feel superior to the poor Jew.

In our own country we are not altogether free of this sinister appeal to persons who want a sense of importance, authority, and power—who want to be recognized. But the desire for self-respect and the respect of others, the desire for companionship on a level of appreciation, is legitimate and commendable. We hear a great deal about the dignity of the individual, but thousands of individuals feel that they count for nothing even when they are doing useful work. Psychologists have remarked that strikes are sometimes called, not because the employees want more pay, but because they want to be noticed and to show that

they are important to the community. Man is gregarious. He wants to join and he wants approval and, as far as possible, distinction.

Reputation is a motive that makes the glue of society. It holds it together. Men are imitative. They follow tradition and convention, and they like to be thought well of. They have a common code of ideals and a common stock of ideas. Many would rather die than be found lacking in certain principles of conduct. "What will people say?" affects them more than "How much is there in it?"

"Keeping up with the Jones's" is the chief hobby of millions. They must be up to date, in the fashion, in dress, automobile, slang, dancing, popular music, books, and the theater. Their vanity, their desire for display, is easily played upon by the salesman. "Mrs. Smith bought one this morning," "They're wearing stripes this year," "That's last year's model." Popular education appeals very largely to the same motive. Progress in thought is very slow, but the fashions in ideas change rapidly. Lecturers on current events, on the latest fad or favorite in literature, religion, or politics, make it easy for many superficial listeners to accumulate a stock of phrases and gossip that will serve in most conversation as well as genuine thought.

But Shakespeare speaks of the soldiers

> Seeking the bubble reputation
> Even in the cannon's mouth.

The desire for praise or approval is strong in everybody and inspires generosity, heroism, nobility, as well as the petty "showing off." Honesty, loyalty, and courage are real and controlling forces in the lives of many who would rather die than fail in them.

Entertainment. You know how easy it is to touch the motive of fun and excitement. It covers an inexhaustible list of subjects. Men and women like to loaf and they like to play. They like action and a change of scene. They want to get away from their dull and commonplace lives.

Escape is the word we use for this universal want. We get enjoyment

in vicariously living the lives of others. Movies, novels, travel talks, magazines, gossip, and pictures in *Life* and *Look*—all combined can scarcely meet the demand for transportation into the realms of fancy, luxury, mystery, and romance.

Curiosity. Man is inquisitive as well as acquisitive. He wants news. He asks questions. He wants to know what is going on and what it means. The war has extended his range of curiosity enormously. He sees that happenings in distant places may affect him seriously. Old subjects take on new significance. Even the "dismal science," economics, he now recognizes as related to his bread and butter.

But his most interesting subject is still people. They are the story, action, variety, and drama of life. The historical novel absorbs many to whom history is dead and dreary. Stalin and Molotov are vital subjects to Americans who wouldn't read a word of "Das Kapital."

The Higher Motives. You might suspect, on noting this catalogue of wants, that man is just a greedy animal without the animal's stability and restraint. But you know better. In fact, your faith in man lies in his generosity, his courage, his heroism, his humility, his patience, sympathy, and humor. Everyone knows these virtues exist and that life wouldn't be worth living if they didn't. He likes to think he has them. He loses his self-respect if he discovers he lacks generosity and courage. He has a conscience, too, and makes flimsy excuses to himself when he isn't decent to others. The animal feels no sin, guilt, or remorse, but most humans do—enough, indeed, to make good business for psychiatrists.

The sentiments have always been touched, not only by orators, but by every kindly person. Good will, honesty, fair play, courtesy, liberty, duty, religion, patriotism mean something in every business, but are especially near the surface in every audience. Tears flow easily, sympathy and all brave and generous emotions expand quickly in every group.

Study Human Nature. The motives that prompt listeners to pay attention are many more, you see, than need to be discussed. "Know human nature" is a tiresome piece of advice. Most of us think we know

enough about it, but we use what little we do know in an absent-minded and perfunctory fashion. We fail, in speeches, to get into the "you attitude" of practical business-letter writers and salesmen. Sometimes we don't wish to. We know we couldn't make the speech at all if we had to answer the first questions of any audience: "Why should I listen to this? What is there in it for me?"

The answers must be found before you compose the speech. Otherwise the target is obscure, the fire misdirected. So after you have considered the audience and the occasion and have chosen your subject, be sure to provide the proper food and stimulation for that want which is likely to be most insistent—getting a job, making money, achieving ambition, being inspired, hearing a good yarn, being reassured. Give your audience help in making a decision, in clarifying their inarticulate and muddled beliefs. Bring graceful and stirring tributes to persons who are being honored. Provide a good time, when that is the obvious want, with novelties, jokes, amusing and entertaining talk.

Testing. The principles discussed in the first three chapters are illustrated in the following address by Paul Garrett. It has a conversational intimacy, it suits precisely the audience and the occasion, it addresses the mood and want of the listeners.

The very title is a skillful thrust into the heart of the graduating student's doubts and preoccupations; the thoughtful, reminiscent greeting establishes good will and a sense of kinship; the discussion of management as a profession is practical and inspirational. Management is defined in terms of many activities. Eight types are listed and briefly discussed. This treatment permits a simple outline easy to recall and suggesting comparison and contrast.

The conclusion of the speech stresses the importance of management as a social, national problem. It means leadership, opportunity, responsibility. The last words are a parting exhortation and a courteous Godspeed.

The speech itself is a good example of management, extending from the blueprint stage, through the collecting of the raw materials, the tooling and manufacturing, and the satisfactory delivery of the order.

IF I HAD YOUR CHANCE

By Paul Garrett, Vice-president, General Motors Corporation, delivered at Whitman College, June 8, 1947

Mr. President, Members of the Graduating Class, Guests: It is an inspiration to me to return in this manner to the institution that started me on my life course. I well recall the thrill of my arrival that first Sunday morning. I strolled across the campus here to Billings Hall, along a walk improvised from planks, suitcase in hand. The world seemed to me a wonderful place.

I am sure it is as wonderful to you today. For on this day you deserve to experience that glorious feeling of satisfaction that comes from reaching an important milestone. You have worked hard. You have made sacrifices. You have acquired training and knowledge. You possess new tools you will learn how to use in search of progress. For this is no final goal. It is but preparation for something you want but have not yet achieved.

In years it is a long time since I left these grounds as a graduate. A great deal has been crowded into the intervening time—two world wars, economic crises, physical changes in the campus setting. Yet, viewed through the eyes of the spirit, very little has changed. The same ideals, the same thirst for knowledge, the same longing to test your mettle exist as when I struggled with my own problems as a student and dreamed my own dreams. . . .

It so happens you are living in a period of history when the course of human affairs is especially confused by powerful cross-currents in political, economic and social thinking. Tremendous forces are pulling at each other. The struggle is a struggle of ideas. But the underlying issue is clear. The issue is whether individual man after groping his way through centuries of repression is to be thrown back into the grip of totalitarian forces.

Slowly the consciousness is spreading that individual freedoms derive from economic foundations as well as political, social and intellectual bases. Underneath the yearning for a better pattern of life is a stark reality of the means to live—of providing the economic necessities required before people can advance socially and culturally. Europe was for centuries the center of civilization. Is it not strange in an age of stratosphere flying and atomic energy that the age-old fears of hunger and cold once more hold in their grasp most of that great continent?

So desperate is the demand for food, shelter and clothing that strange

political and economic ideologies gather believers from the ranks of those who hope new leaders can miraculously produce these necessities.

Does this phenomenon arise solely from the destruction and dislocations of the war? I think not. It goes back farther. For the dictators themselves built their cases upon a growing unrest arising from the inability of peoples to pull their standards of living up to the standards of scientific and technical knowledge current at the time.

So there is this growing awareness everywhere that the freedom, the dignity, the progress of the individual must rest upon a sound economy. They must rest upon a system that produces abundance. The vital role of the United States in the world today is to keep alive and strengthen the only way of life so far found that sets a solid economic foundation under man's moral and spiritual aspirations.

I do not know to what tasks you may now turn your hands. But I do know that every young man and every young woman in this auditorium must have these basic ingredients of our own democratic society very near at heart to understand and deal with the world we are living in.

Members of all professions, technicians, housewives of the nation—all have a momentous stake in the issues confronting us. All can render immeasurably to their own interest by keeping alert to the problems and solutions presented. For the affairs of our economy are not a thing apart. They enter into the fabric of everyday living.

When I had my chance I did not realize that there was even then evolving a profession upon which would fall great responsibility for leadership in dealing with problems of all kinds in this area. I refer to management, which is the way you run a farm, a shop or an industry. To me at that time business was something you just drifted into if you were not competent to take up one of the recognized professions or if all you wanted in life was money. It would not have occurred to me that an ambitious young man of ideals and vision might turn to industry for an ideal life profession. I did not understand what industry was. And to the widespread persistence of such lack in understanding can be attributed a great share of our present world troubles. . . .

The medical scientist has yet to solve the riddle of cancer. The nuclear physicist has torn down the atom but must still find a way to harness its terrible energy. So the manager in industry has but begun to unravel the problems that confront him. The manager in some ways has made less progress as yet than the others for his is the newest of the great professions.

Basically the problem of management is to produce more goods and services for satisfying people's wants at prices more people can afford to pay. This is not a job for a few men in a few big companies. It is the job of the thousands upon thousands of individuals who have the responsibility of operating the nation's businesses, large and small, of all kinds. For businesses in this country are interdependent. So are workers. They pay each other's wages. They consume each other's products.

At this stage of world development your generation has the responsibility for advancing new concepts of management. Government cannot do it. If I had your chance I would become a disciple of good management for what it can do in America quite apart from any plan I might have for my own life work. If I had your chance to assess again what I might do with my life I would view management very differently than I did in your place, as an endeavor very worthy of my best fiber. For management is not only itself a profession. It is a part of all professions.

Management at any level of responsibility offers fields of endeavor as varied and as challenging as anything you can find, for:

1. We need managers to explore ways to assure us a flow of raw materials sufficient to meet the ever multiplying wants of the nation.

America is a land abundantly blessed with resources. But the war uncovered serious shortages affecting both military and peacetime needs. Beyond existing resources we must have for the manufacturing process more and new materials that cannot be dug from the ground or carried from our forests. It is a management function to plan long-range programs for developing these materials economically.

2. We need managers to find techniques ever to improve our manufacturing processes.

During war American industry demonstrated its ability based on peacetime experience to turn out complex technical products in unprecedented quantities. Now further ways must be found to produce more goods people want with better quality at lower costs. That is the way to raise the standards of those who have the least. A hand-built automobile may be of wonderful quality and design. But who can afford it? Penicillin and the sulfa drugs when first discovered held out great promise in medicine's fight on disease but there again a management problem had to be solved. How could these

new medicines be produced in sufficient quantity and at a price low enough to meet people's needs?

3. We need managers to utilize new sources of energy.

Modern production is partly a problem in efficient utilization of various sources of energy from water power to the atom. Science can point the way. But application for the general good is a management problem. Electricity as a principle was known for hundreds of years before Thomas Edison. But its application to production methods and to raise the living standards of all the people was a contribution of management.

4. We need managers to develop ways for a more effective distribution of goods.

It has often been said that we have mastered in our economy the art of production but lag in the science of distribution. Even in our wealthy country —virtually the only land in the world where no one goes hungry—shortages in one area occur simultaneously with surpluses in another. How can we improve our methods and reduce the costs of distributing the products of field, forest and factory so more people can have more?

5. We need managers to show us better how to make progress and still maintain stability.

The war and its aftermath have affected the equilibrium of our economy. Debt expansion and mounting wage and material costs have been reflected in the price structure. The business cycle is an economic phenomenon that needs as much study as any complicated research project in the physical sciences. Yet stability should not be our only goal. For primitive economies have stability but living standards always remain at the same low level. We seek stability with progress.

6. We need managers to solve the delicate problems of human relationships in industry.

Management has come close to mastering techniques and processes but it still lags in the art of dealing with people—with employes, with customers, with the public. If industry is to play its role in maintaining our way of life it must ever more effectively act and think with regard for the wishes and aspirations of people.

This problem will test the statesmanship of management in the future. It is a matter of interpreting so all can understand the mutuality of interests existing between management and all other segments of society. Worker and management interests run parallel with each other. Every worker has a stake in the success of industry. Every manager has a stake in the welfare of the worker.

7. We need managers to understand our new role in world trade.

Headlines daily bring into focus the picture of a world that cannot lastingly know peace except as it deals realistically with economics. The business manager in your generation must be world-minded. He must understand that our success in preserving peace will depend importantly on how well we manage world trade policies. Once sound policies have been agreed upon it is a managerial function to implement them. It is not a matter of America playing Santa Claus. It is a matter of stimulating other nations to help themselves.

8. We need managers to plan research on all questions that pertain to our scientific, economic and social welfare.

In America we possess in the research organizations of our industrial enterprises a reservoir of technical knowledge unequaled anywhere. Even in the pure sciences research today rarely is carried on by individuals working alone. For research is a highly technical process requiring the specialized knowledge of teams of research workers. It requires planning and coordination which are management functions. Large sums have to be expended with no guarantee that they will be recouped. Disappointment follows disappointment.

Managerial functions must be discharged so they will contribute to social progress—to the well-being of people in community and nation. Here indeed is a huge and only partly explored field for further management research.

9. We need managers who can do all these things but do them on a sound business basis.

Those of you interested in the state of our economy have been made aware recently of the fact that industry over the past year or so has been operating at relatively high profit levels. It happens that until very recently this has not been true of my own industry. But the point I want to make is that industry does not operate under a profit system. It operates under a profit and loss

system. Even in good years as many as half of our businesses often fail to make a profit. Few in critical times can stay out of the red.

Unless a business can stay in the black over the long term, averaging the bad years with the good, it cannot sustain itself. A manager may have laudable social intentions of providing security for his employes, better products at lower prices for his customers. But if he cannot keep the business going in realizing these intentions he is defeated before he begins.

An unsound business is one that fails in its obligation to society by failing to make a profit over the years out of which to provide means for future growth. Only a profitable business can afford the expensive research needed to improve products for customers. And no business can provide security for workers or investors unless it is in a position to satisfy customer wants.

I might add that those managerial requirements bear on our ability to continue the creation of those surpluses in goods and services which have made our standards of living here so outstanding. Surpluses in an economy build schools, hospitals and highways. They foster the arts and sciences and provide the means for expanding economic and social horizons.

My plea to those of you who may in the future be concerned with management is that you prepare yourselves thoughtfully just as for any other profession. Then bring to your profession the same devotion to principles and ideals as does the young doctor when he swears the oath of Hippocrates. No matter what your preparation, finally you are on your own.

A professor of medicine at the University of Southern California had taken his boys through all of the texts he knew in medicine during their four-year course. At graduation he called them together. He said: "Now that you have finished your course I want to tell you one thing more. Half of all I have taught you is wrong. But the trouble is, I don't know which half." So break your own problems down. Find solutions of your own testing. That is what the professor in effect bade his students do. That is management.

Become management-minded the day you start your first job whatever that job may be. Assume responsibility. Take the initiative. Become a leader. Organize your own job. Train others for your job. Management is not a title. Nor is it a salary bracket. It is a state of mind that needs to be assiduously cultivated. Like the aspiring concert pianist the manager must tediously practice for many years if he would reach perfection. Management starts where you are. Grow in management stature by doing well each small job you have an opportunity to do.

Not long ago I had dinner with a delegation of Swedish gentlemen on an industrial tour of this country. They commented on the fact that in America we have a word that we use over and over for which there is no synonym in the Swedish language. The word was opportunity. I learned subsequently that there was no synonym for our word opportunity in the Russian language or the German. These very intelligent Swedish delegates told me that in translating our word opportunity, they use a word which in our language is best translated as luck. And that of course connotes something very different. . . .

You have the mental equipment and the training to become outstanding among your fellows in capitalizing the opportunities your country offers. From your ranks the nation obtains its professional leaders in industry, the sciences and government. Your opportunity for leadership is great indeed. But with leadership goes responsibility.

You face one of those challenges in America destined to stand in history. It is a challenge that calls for supreme effort and great wisdom. But the objective is becoming clear. Before you is the responsibility to keep freedom in America. At no time in the history of the world have the stakes been higher. To preserve the dignity of individual man. To remove the fear of want and oppression. To preserve these United States as a rock of material and spiritual strength in a world of chaos. To bring eventual peace with well-being for all people.

On this day as you step forth into life you are writing the first line on the pages that will constitute your contribution to the history of our great nation. If I had your chance I would regard this responsibility as the most serious job of my generation. In all humility I pray that God may bless your work and make it fruitful to the end that your endeavors may contribute to the happiness of people everywhere, thus assuring your own greatest happiness.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS ON THE ADDRESS

1. What specific ideas and passages show that Mr. Garrett had considered the wants of his audience?
2. What references to the occasion were appropriate and effective?
3. What new point of view about management did the speaker present?
4. What illustrations seemed especially convincing?
5. In which of the nine fields of management are you most interested?
6. What does the speaker say about surpluses in our capitalistic system?
7. What signs of "good management" are evident in the beginning and in the conclusion of the speech?
8. Do you approve of "Thank you" as the last words of a talk? Why?
9. Was this speech, in your impression, extemporized, memorized, or read? Give reasons. In this connection, read Chaps. 6 and 8.

TOPICS SUGGESTED BY THE ADDRESS

1. How It Looks to Me
2. Another Commencement Speaker
3. Public Service
4. Government Planning
5. How Much Socialism?
6. How Much Luck?
7. Working for Yourself
8. What Schooling Can't Give You
9. Opportunity Knocks But Once?
10. Government in Sweden
11. A Promising Line
12. Excessive Prices
13. "The Idle Rich and the Worthless Poor"
14. Threats to Stability
15. How Government Helps Business
16. Business Research
17. New Inventions
18. Does Management Suppress Inventions?
19. Imported Raw Materials
20. Conciliators and Arbitrators
21. Antitrust Action
22. American Five-year Plans
23. Moving About in Business
24. What Aptitude Tests Can't Measure
25. The Underprivileged

CHAPTER IV

FACT FINDING

In business talks you will often need the decisive but hard-to-find fact. You may present arguments for changes in practice or policy, studies of new conditions, of foreign markets, of a new invention—the kind of talk that needs recent and accurate statistics, names, and addresses. You may wish to learn something about a person or an article, about the experience of other companies with a product you are interested in. You should get acquainted with some of the compilations that are specially prepared to give help in these common situations.

The librarian of the college or public library can, of course, direct you to available sources, but you can save yourself considerable time and "leg work" if you are somewhat familiar with the collections of factual material. College librarians have always pointed out the need for more efficient and general use of reference books. Some are now giving courses to freshmen to prepare them for confident, intelligent research.

Here are a few questions culled from projects assigned by the library staff of the College of Business Administration, Boston University. You will be spared the labor of looking up the answers. These are added with the hope that your interested reading will impress you with the practical values in a better knowledge of the great variety of useful reference material at your disposal.

Questions and Answers. 1. How many new dwelling units (total) were constructed in 1940 in urban areas of the United States, and what was the number of families provided for in them?

Answer: 397,000 dwelling units. From "Statistical Abstract of the United States," 1946, p. 767. 220,000 families. From "World Almanac

and Book of Facts for 1943," published by the *New York World Telegram.*

2. Of which government agency is the U.S. Office of Education a department? Since what date? Address?

Answer: Of the Federal Security Agency, since July 1, 1939. Temporary Building M, 26th St. and Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. From the "U.S. Government Manual," published once and sometimes twice a year.

3. How many representatives are there in the government of the state of Massachusetts?

Answer: 240. From "The Book of the States," published by the Council of State Governments, Chicago, 1943–1944.

4. What was the party affiliation of U.S. President Rutherford B. Hayes, how many terms did he serve as president, and what was his religious affiliation?

Answer: Republican; one term; attended the Methodist Church but never joined. From "World Almanac."

5. Where can you find a short evaluation of Ralph Waldo Emerson's "Brahma"?

Answer: In James D. Hart's "Oxford Companion to American Literature," p. 90; published by Oxford University Press, New York, 1941.

6. If you were to search for several expressions by poets, writers, philosophers, on the subject of "Intolerance," in what single compilation would you look for them?

Answer: In "The Home Book of Quotations," selected and arranged by Burton Stevenson; published by Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc., New York, 1947.

7. Name three 1946 articles on "Labor Contracts."

Answer: Titles and references given on p. 378 of "Public Affairs Information Service," annual accumulated bulletin index, 1946, New York.

8. Give references to biographical material (one book and at least three articles) published in 1946 about General George C. Marshall.

Answer: Articles in any of the 1946 issues of the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* and in *Biography Index,* September, 1946, p. 55.

The one book can be found in *Biography Index,* December, 1946. Both indexes are publications of The H. W. Wilson Company, New York.

9. If you were unable to form your own opinion of Frederick Wakeman's novel "The Hucksters," where could you find reviews of it or abstracts from them?

Answer: In the *Book Review Digest,* August, 1946, p. 315.

10. Find an article on "Why Industry Should Decentralize," published in March, 1946.

Answer: In *Industrial Arts Index,* June, 1946, Vol. 34, No. 7, p. 412. Under "Industry—Decentralization" there is a reference to an article by J. A. Krug in *Management Review,* February, 1946, entitled "Why Industry Should Decentralize."

11. Where would you find a good-sized biographical sketch of Andrew Carnegie?

Answer: In "Dictionary of American Biography." This work lists only deceased persons eminent in their fields, and the biographical sketches are lengthy and thorough appraisals.

12. Find a biographical portrait of Beardsley Ruml or Sir William Beveridge.

Answer: In *Current Biography,* a monthly publication cumulative in a yearly volume. The words "biographical portrait" exclude the use of "Who's Who" (British) or "Who's Who in America," both of which give data but not any evaluation of the person's achievements.

13. What was Guatemala's total export in any given year between 1937 and 1947, and how much of it was taken by the United States?

Answer: Found in "The New International Yearbook," published annually and covering the events of the previous year. Another reference is the "Exporters' Encyclopedia." The "South American Handbook" gives only the total export amount without listing the percentage taken by the United States. The "Interamerican Statistical Yearbook" is a good source of information, but it is not in common use.

A Place for Everything. These few samples from the storehouse of classified knowledge are enough to warn you not to give up in the

search for the connecting link or the clinching fact. There are special dictionaries, encyclopedias, biographies, bibliographies, handbooks, manuals, abstracts, indexes, and super-indexes. We expect the librarian to be the universal "Tel-u-where," but business offices should have at hand at least the few volumes that will most frequently serve their needs.

Desk Dictionaries. Three new abridged dictionaries have received much favorable comment: Funk & Wagnalls' "New College Standard Dictionary," the Random House–Harper "American College Dictionary," and the G. & C. Merriam "Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary." All three have been so recently prepared that they list practically all the new words that came into the language during the Second World War and since, including names of persons and places.

Word Books. You should own one or more of these volumes to improve your discrimination in word usage:

FERNALD, JAMES C., "Standard Handbook of Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions," revised, Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York, 1947.

MAWSON, C. O., "Thesaurus of the English Language," Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1936.

"Roget's Pocket Thesaurus, a Treasury of Synonyms and Antonyms," Pocket Books, Inc., New York.

SMITH, S. STEPHENSON, *The Command of Words,* The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York.

Year Books. The most familiar of these are:

"The New International Yearbook."
"The Statesman's Year Book."
"The World Almanac and Book of Facts."
"Statistical Abstract of the United States."

Government Publications. Don't overlook these. They include thousands of pamphlets, books, reports, and leaflets, on every phase of American industry—business, mining, agriculture, housing, manufacturing, education, etc. Businessmen know their practical value. Even *The Kiplinger Washington Letter,* "circulated privately to business-

men," thought one of these reports was important enough to remind its clientele about it in two separate issues. The letter of Jan. 10, 1948, had this:

> You can now get the "City Worker's Family Budget," a gov't report showing what it costs to live. Wrote you about it 3 weeks ago, Dec. 20. Unions will use the figures for wage talks, and you want the text. Write Gov't Printing Office for a copy, Washington 25, D.C. Send 20¢.

The address is the same for all Federal publications. State governments and state universities also publish important pamphlets free or at the same nominal cost set by the policy of the Government Printing Office.

The *Congressional Record* has more useful information about business and public affairs than most people imagine.

Publications by Industry. Many companies distribute genuinely informative material. *Forbes Magazine,* New York, lists and briefly describes some of these in every issue. In the column headed "What's Your Problem?" the editor quotes typical questions and gives answers. Note these:

> Q. How may I go about getting full information on Auto Courts and Motels?
>
> A. Trade magazines covering the field: *Motor Court Age,* 105 Atlas Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; *Tourist Court Journal,* 107 S. First St., Temple, Tex. Trade Association: International Motor Court Association, West Campton, N.H.
>
> Q. Where may I obtain booklets, etc., on lighting, footcandles, or any other type of illumination?
>
> A. Write to: Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., Fixture Division, Ipswich, Mass.; The Edwin F. Guth Co., St. Louis 3, Mo.; General Electric Co., Schenectady, N.Y.

Publications by Nonprofit and Other Organizations. There is a rapidly increasing amount of excellent material issued by societies promoting adult education or engaged in furthering some cause of social or political significance. Here are the names of just a few that will furnish pamphlets free or for a few cents each:

American Civil Liberties Union, New York
American Council on Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.
American Library Association, Chicago
Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.
Congress for Industrial Organization, Washington, D.C.
Cooperative League of the U.S.A., New York
Eastern Railroad Presidents' Conference, New York
Institute of Pacific Relations, New York
Public Affairs Committee, New York
Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.
Town Hall, New York
University of Chicago Round Table, Chicago

Encyclopedias. There are more of these than you may guess. In addition to the "Americana" and the "Britannica," there are a "Scientific Encyclopedia," a "Chemical Encyclopedia," "An Encyclopedia of Sports," another of "Music and Musicians," one of "Food," of "Horticulture," and an "Encyclopedia of Educational Research."

The great encyclopedias have an amazing amount of authoritative and interesting information. Following up all the references and cross references to a subject, you may read hundreds of pages of exposition, analysis, and expert opinion.

Quotation Source Books. Speakers and writers often wish they could find an impressive quotation to make a thought more convincing. Somebody has said the thing much better. Who is it? What is it? Where is it? There are a number of good compilations, but these three have been popular for a long time:

BARTLETT, JOHN, "Familiar Quotations," Little, Brown & Company, Boston, 1948.
"Hoyt's New Cyclopedia of Practical Quotations," Wilcox & Follett Co., Chicago, 1947.
STEVENSON, BURTON, "Home Book of Quotations," Dodd, Mead & Company, Inc., New York, 1947.

Taking Notes. Have a small pad of paper or some 3- by 5-inch cards when you do your reading. Write down the name of the author, the book, and the page number. Make notes or quote exactly with quotation marks. These separate entries will help you to organize your

outline much faster than if they were all written out on two or three large sheets of paper. Don't depend on your memory, no matter how sharp or obvious the printed facts may be. It is easy to forget important items.

Short Cuts. Learn to handle books with dispatch. If you know what you are looking for, you can save considerable time by glancing first at the table of contents and then at the index for specific references to your problem. When you get to a promising chapter, glance at the headings, the opening and closing sentences of paragraphs, the key words. Make brief digests in your own language.

Date of Publication. You should really look at this first. If you want recent factual information, it is a waste of time to look at a book several years old. Prewar books are of no value in connection with certain developments in business, medicine, science, politics, and inventions that have taken place since the war. Get the most recent books, the latest news, discoveries, and opinions available. In some fields of thought many old books are still among the best, but in areas of exploration and rapid change of conditions and practice, the new book just published can summarize the past with the surer knowledge of hindsight and relate it more accurately to what is going on today.

In Matters of Controversy. Public questions are rarely settled without argument. Good, intelligent men and women are found on both or all sides. Through discussion emerges a truth, a principle, a compromise, or an adjustment that is workable in the public interest.

It is often necessary in appraising the value of an article or a book to know something about the author. He may be honest and able but still be steeped in a "climate of opinion" that makes his judgments, in certain matters, comparatively narrow or in part unsound. Writers are like other men in being subject to error, prejudice, or lack of vision. How they were brought up, the life they have lived, the people they associate with, the money they have made, the positions they have held, all contribute to the kind of thinking they reveal. They may be more objective, freer from the pull of personal gain and prejudice than most of us, but we still should read them with guarded attention. We

should not put away their remarks, however, just because we don't agree with them. These should be a challenge to reconsider our point of view, to note the things we may have overlooked, to study experience, evidence, proof, or other solutions more thoughtfully.

You understand this well enough in the case of prominent politicians and a few well-known organizations. You respect ability, honesty, and courage, but you know what to expect and how to withhold judgment, perhaps, when you hear Robert Taft or Henry Wallace or a representative of the NAM or the CIO.

You haven't this familiar attitude with print. It is in a book, more remote, written by a stranger whom you regard as an authority in his field, the schoolmaster and the scholar whose calm, matured judgments need not be questioned. If you knew something about him as you do these others, if you saw pictures of him in the papers and the movies, heard him on the air occasionally, he would be cut down to human size, and you would read him with a degree of questioning intimacy.

This is not to discourage your modesty and respect for your betters. It is to remind you that you grow to genuinely democratic stature through inquiry and discussion. Education seems to be a paradox. It tries to combine doubt and enthusiasm. They are two sides of the same coin. See them in these apothegms:

> A wise scepticism is the first attribute of a good critic.
>
> JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

> Skepticism is slow suicide.
>
> RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

Emerson had experiment in mind, the creative spirit which does things, makes progress by surmounting doubt and failure. "Nothing great," he says, "was ever achieved without enthusiasm." And, we still may add, the reasoning, critical attitude of mind.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Give a talk on the latest developments in television. Name the sources of your information.
2. Discuss the size and nature of our trade with Japan. List the articles and books of reference.
3. How are public-opinion polls conducted? What objections are sometimes made to them? Quote from your sources.
4. Give latest estimates of the population of the United States, of your state, of your city or town.
5. How do population trends affect some lines of business?
6. How do California oranges differ from Florida oranges?
7. Give a talk on business conditions in western Europe.
8. Give a talk on the opportunities of employment with an American firm in South America.
9. Give a short biography of one of the following: Sir William Beveridge, Joseph Stalin, Thomas E. Dewey, Paul G. Hoffman, Trygve Lie, John Steinbeck.
10. Cite available statistics about unemployment in Germany. Discuss business conditions in that country.
11. Give a five-minute talk on Alexander Hamilton.
12. Discuss types of prefabricated houses.
13. What metals, and in what amounts, are now supplied the United States by foreign countries?
14. Give a report based on recent statistics on Boulder Dam or on TVA.
15. What line of business in your neighborhood seems especially prosperous or promising for a career?
16. Suppose you wanted to go into the retail business for yourself. What kind of goods would you sell, where would you rent a store, how would you operate it?
17. Discuss some reviews of a current popular book.
18. Give a talk on soil conservation in the United States.
19. Where does most of our lumber come from? Give a talk on the industry.
20. What serious competition does the American cotton industry have to meet?
21. What goods are most heavily taxed in this country?
22. Give a talk on the Arabian oil industry.
23. What substitutes for oil are in process of development? Discuss their prospects.
24. What foreign automobiles, and how many, are being sold in the United States?
25. Discuss the tariffs on goods from Canada. What tariffs does Canada impose on goods from the United States?
26. How are trade agreements between the United States and other countries arrived at? Cite an example with its specific conditions.

27. What is the nature of business in Mexico? Is it improving? What and how much do we import from Mexico? What do we sell that country?
28. What are our prospects of trade with the Far East? What American companies engage in business there?
29. Get some statistics on passenger and freight business of American air lines to Europe.
30. Give a talk on a special reference book. Tell the general nature of its contents and give some items of information that you found interesting.

CHAPTER V

ORGANIZING THE SPEECH

Chesterton tells of a gardener who overheard his master declaiming: "Mr. Speaker, had I for one moment thought of the possibility that you would call upon me this evening," etc. Chesterton adds, "It takes a long time to prepare an impromptu." If a man is called upon unexpectedly and does well at a moment's notice, it is usually because he has faced the same kind of situation before and may use appropriately the same ideas and illustrations that were acceptable at that time. He is giving a prepared talk. Or it may be that the occasion presents a very specific suggestion that can be amplified into an effective short talk.

The fruitful cues of discussion in a conference, or debate on a motion, may stimulate one to a few pointed remarks and encourage practice for coolness, fluency, and poise, but they do not furnish enough material, as a rule, for a sustained and strategic address. When the experienced speaker finds no hints or cues, he takes warning from the familiar beatitude: "Blessed is the man who hath nothing to say—and cannot be persuaded to say it." [1] He is at least very brief and saves his reputation for good sense and good speaking.

It takes time to put a good speech together. The power or charm that may beguile an audience and discourage a beginner is somewhat deceiving. Its artistry conceals the works that allow it to function so delightfully. And this is right. Nobody but the maker, or the student, is interested in the tools or the parts. A speech is, of course, more than a machine. Some speeches sound like machines, but those we like have the breath of life. They have had time to grow. Warmed by the brooding thoughtfulness of their composers, they have emerged and risen from the assembling of parts.

[1] See Brander Matthews, "Notes on Speech-making."

You have already had cues enough to find a live subject. Your next job is to keep it alive for your audience.

Five Steps. When you sit down to compose your speech, place before you the "Open Letter" written years ago by Lyman Abbott and reprinted in Brander Matthews' "Notes on Speech-making." Follow this simple outline and you are well on your way. Here it is:

> In special preparation, [there are] five successive steps: (1) What is the object of this speech? What end is it to serve? What verdict is it to win? What result is it to accomplish? (2) Central thought. What thought lodged in the mind of an auditor will best accomplish the desired result? (3) Analysis of this central thought into three or four propositions, the enforcement and illustration of which will serve to fasten in the minds of the hearers the central thought, and so to secure the desired result. (4) Some illustrations or concrete statements of each of these separate propositions. (5) These four points firmly fixed in the mind; then an endeavor on these lines of thought to win this result with this audience, exactly as one would endeavor to win assent from an individual.

Now, Abbott, like most experienced speakers, makes the route look easy, and that is encouraging. His own mind, through long familiarity with his subjects, was stocked with "the propositions, the enforcement and illustrations," and he may have taken for granted that most speakers would discover them readily enough by themselves. The fact seems to be, however, that they do not. Dull speaking is caused in large part by the laziness or inability to find the order, design, and filler which are necessary for interesting and convincing talk. So you had better fill in Abbott's useful list with a few subheads and reminders.

Limiting Your Subject. When you have found your general subject, your first step in preparing it is to focus it upon your audience in the ways already suggested. It makes considerable difference, too, whether you have five minutes, fifteen, a half hour or an hour. Only the best speakers can hold an audience longer than an hour, and they take serious risks of failure. If the chairman expects you to speak thirty minutes do not embarrass him by speaking five or forty-five.

You know now what topics you can develop most profitably in the

time at your disposal. You would like to talk, let us say, about Mexico. But that is too large a subject. It is appropriate for a volume, but if you try to discuss it in the compass of a chapter you will have only a skeleton, an outline, a mere list of topics and suggestions, none of which you will have time to develop interestingly. Do not wander aimlessly in a large field. The more restricted your subject the better. You can cultivate it and enrich it with color, story, comparison, and other details of vividness until the speech has the flavor of you as well as of Mexico in it. So you will draw off a number of definite titles from "Mexico," such as,

American Oil Wells in Mexico	Village Life in Mexico
The Railroad Situation in Mexico	Making Money in Mexico
Mexico for the Mexicans	A Year in Vera Cruz

The Central Idea. Speculate upon your topic until you get an idea that gives meaning, force, and purpose to the whole speech. By way of example read the speech by Oswald W. Knauth, "Fundamentals of Merchandising," page 88. The title is noncommittal, but a glance through the address will show that the speaker had one idea that controlled and directed the use of everything else in the speech. He wished to press the point that public-utility companies can merchandise their appliances more profitably through the regular retail organizations than through their own retail stores. Almost everything that went into the talk was chosen for its value in making that basic thought more vivid and compelling.

Discovering Related Material. The central idea needs considerable support, and sometimes the mind moves slowly and confusingly in search of satisfactory explanation, argument, and appeal. First the speaker collects a mass of available suggestions from which to select and reject. The quickest and most practical way is to take a pencil and jot down things as they come to you. Ask yourself questions. Take a lesson from Kipling:

> I keep six honest serving-men
> (They taught me all I knew)—
> Their names are What and Why and When
> And How and Where and Who.

Mr. Knauth in preparing his talk on electrical appliances may have dug up rich material by probing in this fashion:

What are the chief considerations in all merchandising?
How does electrical merchandising differ from other kinds?
What are the chief articles of electrical merchandising?
Why do the manufacturers prefer their own stores?
Why not use existing retail organizations?
Who should set the retail prices on electrical goods?
Why should not the power company go in for retailing?
Why should prices be fixed?
When should prices be changed?
When are sales the largest?
How many lines should be carried?
Where is the present system of merchandising most profitable?
How can manufacturers vie in merchandising with skilled retailers?
What are the expected advantages?
How can the consumption of current be increased?
Who are the retailers best acquainted with the merchandising of electrical goods?
Where can some useful comparative statistics be had?
What economies in present methods could be effected?
How can the advertising be improved?
What retail organizations could greatly increase the sale of electrical goods?
How can present duplication be avoided?
Why are the costs of selling needlessly high?
Why is the customer not getting the best service?
Why should retailers object to public utilities doing their own retailing?
Where is the competition most felt?

And so he might have continued until he found all he wanted. Many things brought to light by this questioning may have been irrelevant or inappropriate. Others would have to be given up for the sake of conciseness. But the treasure trove has been revealed, and the speaker may cull and choose plenty for his needs. His next problem is to put whatever he selects into some kind of working order. A little experimenting with the electric products material would suggest this simple and logical arrangement:

1. The elements of good merchandising
2. Special factors in the selling of electrical goods

3. The cost of distribution
4. Methods of public utility retail selling
5. Advantages
6. Disadvantages
7. The selling of current as related to the selling of goods
8. Retail organizations compared with power company stores

How to Expand the Idea. The skeleton must have flesh and blood. A meager statement of a few leading ideas is seldom enough to interest an audience. Abstractions and generalities must grow and expand in the warmth of comparison and contrast, illustration, detail, proof, and examples. A central idea is only a pale sketch until the artist fills it with the colors and images that arrest the eye, emphasize the dominant note, and give significance to the whole. All speaking and writing are developed, amplified, through one or more of the four general forms: narration, description, exposition or explanation, and argument. A novel is of course chiefly narration, but it requires for clearness and interest considerable support from the others. A business talk may be chiefly explanation or argument, but the speaker often finds that an illustration will illuminate the explanation so well that he may dispense with further argument. Even abstractions have to come through the senses. We see them, hear them, smell them, taste them, or feel them. The great majority see first, and most images are therefore directed to the eye.

Comparison and Contrast. But the major forms of discourse are not self-starting, nor do they advance without frequent stimulations or explosions. They do suggest the automobile or the rocket for analogy or comparison. Comparison, with its mate, contrast, is indeed the chief principle or method noted by Aristotle, and all other rhetoricians since his day, for keeping talk going and going somewhere. We literally learn nothing except through comparison. The teacher's slogan is: "From the known to the unknown." The new thing is like this which you know so well. It is unlike in this or that respect. In business, as elsewhere, we have to make many choices, buy one thing or the other, do this or that. We have to compare even familiar things very often to

discover which will give us the greater profit. Mr. Knauth, in the speech considered above, has for his chief point a comparison between two systems of retailing.

Sometimes a short paragraph, a small cluster of striking contrasts, lights up an idea almost dazzlingly. Dr. Arthur D. Little, speaking on "The Fifth Estate," did not need to elaborate this statement:

> It is incomparably more profitable to draw the Gumps for a comic supplement than to write the "Origin of Species." There is more money in chewing-gum than in relativity. Lobsters and limousines are acquired far more rapidly by the skillful thrower of custard pies in a moving-picture studio than by the no less skillful demonstrator of the projection of electrons. The gate receipts of an international prizefight would support a university faculty for a year.

On the other hand, a comparison may take the form of a carefully built-up analogy, an attempt to associate a prosaic and money-grubbing occupation—felt to be so at least by the employee whose imagination is dulled by routine—with religious and romantic service and splendor. This is a favorite method of the inspirational talk. We are crusaders in a great service. We are like this or that great institution beloved or revered. Let us lay a little flattering unction to our souls and let us take fire from this great purpose and possibility. The comparison is by no means "the bunk." In details it may be far-fetched, but it has an essential truth or, what is more important, a tremendous power of suggestion which renewed self-respect and enthusiasm may convert into actual truth. Charles Dyer Norton, in speaking to the agents of the Northwestern Life Insurance Company, used a comparison rich in fruitful implications.

> I do not wish to go too far afield for a comparison, but I like to think that in the upbuilding of these life insurance companies of ours there is going forward a communal movement similar to that which eight hundred years ago, in France, resulted in the erection of the great Gothic cathedrals. For centuries those majestic churches have stood guard over the villages and cities which created them. We know very little of the men who planned them, but we know that they were the leaders of their time, just as the foremost men in

the business world today are managing these great insurance companies. We know that there was immense local pride and rivalry. We know that to the common project the artisan gave part of his time every year; the farmer gave a part of his yearly crop, just as to-day almost every American home is contributing to the upbuilding of these great institutions of ours.

We know that no architect in the early Gothic period foresaw the triumphs that were to come to his successors. The principles of the art were worked out in actual experiment, until it was found that such glorious structures as Amiens and Chartres and Rheims were possible. In time the lofty pillars of the nave stood like a forest of elms carved in stone; the soaring spire became the embodiment of human hopes; the rose window radiated a glory which no modern glass-painter has ever equalled.

The people came to pray and lingered to exchange the news. Children, tired of play in the open square, would steal into the cool shadows to watch the pencils of dancing sunlight. Widowed women, in the extremity of grief and weakness, sought consolation there, as they faced the uncertain future, for death spelled disaster in those old days. Old men came, in the evening of life, to gaze at the mighty pillars, into which they had poured their young strength.

Some of the cathedrals have not endured. Some, even now, after the lapse of centuries, are yielding to slow time and decay, and some are standing as they will stand for unnumbered centuries to come, firm as the hills—a true and noble type of all that is finest and most enduring in human endeavor.

We, too, gentlemen, are builders; stone by stone we have seen the great structure of our Company rise under the direction of master hands. Our architects have not sought for size, but enduring strength with which to span the centuries safely; traditions of conservation so strong that they become iron, if unwritten laws, in the very constitution of the Company itself. Steadily, year after year, they have selected the better material and rejected the worse, until two hundred thousand of the sturdiest and most conservative homes in America are vitally interested in this great structure.

Stop a moment and think of that widow, kneeling in the great French cathedral eight centuries ago, her sorrow embittered by the consciousness of a future of actual toil in the field, and think of the American mother, in that same tragic situation to-day, her home protected by a magnificent communal institution, which, though invisible, dominates modern society, as the cathedrals tower over the ancient villages of France. Consider what it will mean,

when the time comes, as come it must, if we are faithful to our duty, when every American home will be so protected. Consider the effect upon the Republic when no home is destroyed by unexpected death, when no boy is deprived of the education for which his father planned, when no girl is thrust into a sordid situation in the struggle for existence.

Think of these things for a little time, and if your heart grows warm, if a current flows through your soul, transforming the carbon of everyday routine into a glowing radiance, yield to that inspiration, gentlemen, for that is the true enthusiasm! It will gain you a hearing from the most inert. It will win you honest victories, and make you desire none other. It will bring you joy in your work. It will double your efficiency. It will transform you from the man you are into the man you wish to be.

The Symbol. Abstractions, principles, are motivating forces, but they need frequent clarifying. The great leader spends his life in telling us what we already know. He gives our vague and confused ideas names and order. He makes it easier for us to remember and so to act decisively. Mahatma Gandhi, leading, teaching, speaking for millions in India, had certainly need of the vivid and revealing symbol, the comparison that makes all clear. Mr. C. F. Andrews, English administrator in India, explaining Gandhi's program to the Foreign Policy Association, merely used the comparison which Gandhi made familiar all over India:

Let me give you very briefly his program. I wish you to see how practical it is and how suited to the situation. Then I shall try to show you how it can only be carried out truly by Indians themselves and in their own way. This is the method in which Mahatma Gandhi gives his program to the multitudes. [The speaker then held up his right hand before the audience.] Gandhi says: "Here is my hand. Here are the five fingers. Here is the wrist. Now, then, let us get the program." In this didactic manner he shows even to the simplest villagers what he stands for and how he intends to lead the nation. He gives them his "five point" campaign in detail and they keep it in their mind owing to the symbol of the hand and its five fingers.

Let me give you the five fingers of the program, and then show you the force which binds them all together. Here are the five fingers. The first of all things to be aimed at by the moral leader of the Indian people is to do away

with these terrible religious differences. Therefore "Hindu-Muslim unity," the unity between the two great religions of India, forms the very beginning of his program.

Let us get the second point in his program: "Prohibition of all drinks and drugs from the sacred soil of India." That is the second part of his program—no more opium to be sold by government opium monopolies.

The third point in his program is: "Woman's equality with man." Mahatma Gandhi through and through stands for Indian womanhood, and in his own asram women have in every single thing equality with the men of the asram where he lives.

The fourth point in his program is: "Removal of untouchability." This refers to that class in the country—the depressed class, the class which was outcast hitherto, which in South India is called the pariah class. This shall be depressed no longer, but shall have in every single way the same rights as the highest Brahmin in the land. Gandhi stands for that—the removal of all untouchability. To show how he carries it out (he has a family of four sons, no daughters), he has taken a little pariah child as his own daughter and introduced her into his own family.

The last, and perhaps the greatest of all points in his program—for I speak today as a villager, as one of those agricultural people who number 90 per cent of the population—is what we call in India *Khadder*. This word means home-spinning and home-weaving—the making in the villages themselves of the cloth the people use. He wishes the people in the villages to use their spare time in home-spinning, when, on account of the heat and the dryness of the soil, they cannot possibly do agricultural work. This 90 per cent of India must not be kept unemployed for five months in the year, but rather use the months of unemployment (when they cannot do agricultural work) in home-spinning and home-weaving. He declares that as soon as the economic program of India is complete, and Indian poverty is mitigated by having two hands to work with—one of home-spinning and the other of agriculture—then India will be comparatively prosperous. It will raise its head out of the dust of poverty—poverty such as there is none in the world today; it will gather strength through the effort, through the industry itself, through rising out of lethargy into activity; it will, through these moral efforts, raise itself morally and demand morally *Swaraj*, where today in depression it can only think of poverty and misery.

That, then, is the fivefold program: (1) Hindu-Muslim unity, (2) pro-

hibition of all drinks and drugs, (3) women's equality with men, (4) removal of untouchability and (5) *Khadder,* or home-spinning in all our 750,000 villages.

That is the program, but here is the wrist which binds the fingers together. What is the wrist? The wrist is *Ahimsa*. *A* is the *alpha* of Greek. It means "not." *Himsa* is violence. Mahatma Gandhi says: "We must get the whole of our program by moral means, not by violent means; we must get it all through soul force, through moral force, not by violence."

American businessmen are not slow in discovering effective symbols. C. E. Wilson, President of General Motors, closed a speech to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers with a natural but ingenious use of the automobile engine:

Free enterprise and its essential elements can be compared to an automobile engine and its parts. Savings and credit are the flywheel, banks and financial institutions are the crankshaft balancers and the lubrication system. Confidence is the self starter. The hope of a profit is the spark plug and ignition system and the fuel used is the productive effort of all of us who work. The octane number of the fuel is raised through education, initiative and attitude toward work. At present some people feel that the fuel has a pretty low octane number which cuts down the power of the engine and makes it knock a bit.

As efficient and useful as this free enterprise engine is, I still believe that it can and will be improved just as I believed twenty-five years ago that the rough and at that time somewhat inefficient four-cylinder motor car engines, that we thought were so marvelous, could be improved. But I am certainly against discarding this proven efficient engine that gave the American people the highest standard of living in the world and replacing it with some imported type from *east of the Rhine* or even from England—like for example the jet engine—which has only one spark plug, the state, and depends for its power on a blast of hot air.

Definition and Restatement. It is sometimes best to begin a talk by calling attention to common misconceptions of the subject being discussed. A whole course of thinking goes astray if we do not quite know what we are talking about. In the pet phrase of college debaters, let us define our terms. When we see more precisely what the thing is and

what it is not, we shall not be arguing at cross-purposes and shall save time and tempers. Definition may be the synonym of the dictionary or the explanation, the restatement, of a whole book. Notice how Ivy L. Lee in a speech before a convention of the American Electric Rail Roads Association clears the air of any sentimental or over-optimistic illusions his listeners may have in regard to publicity. At the outset he insists that they know what they are asking for.

Publicity must not be thought of as it is by a good many as a sort of umbrella to protect you against the rain of an unpleasant public opinion. Publicity must not be regarded as a bandage to cover up a sore and enable you to get along pretty well with the real trouble still there. Publicity must, if your trouble is to be cured, be considered rather as an antiseptic which shall cleanse the very source of the trouble and reveal it to the doctor, which is the public. To change the metaphor again, publicity must not be thought of as a cloak to look well on the outside of a body diseased and deformed within. It must be looked on as rather a social X-ray which shall reveal the bone and the tissue, even the very heart, of the body itself. No one must attempt to adopt publicity or make use of it for his benefit unless he is prepared to take all the consequences.

A company cannot sing of its prosperity to security holders and at the same time cry over its poverty to tax appraisers and its workingmen. Publicity is distinctly a weapon that cuts both ways, and unless a man is willing to tell everything openly, he had better not "monkey" with publicity. If his desire is simply to avail himself of publicity where it benefits him, and to get behind the curtain when he does not want publicity, my advice to him is to let it alone.

Examples. An assertion frequently prompts the question: "For instance?" The topic sentence of a newspaper paragraph is followed by striking instances of "audacity speeded up and powerfully broadcast."

Audacity is the imperial note of all the developments, audacity speeded up and powerfully broadcast. The modern version of the adventurous knight is the promoter at work—James Bright, the Missouri stock breeder, ranching in the Everglades and vociferously forcing that stubborn and slippery marsh to yield pastures for dairy cows and blooded stock. Or the millionaire at play—Paris Singer plotting a new Monte Carlo north of Palm Beach, or Alfred

Major breeding hybrid citrons in the mountain lakes. It is an audacity that rakes the world for ideas and for building materials. The old roofs of Cuba and Puerto Rico have been transported wholesale to cover the villas of American grandees. Ex-governor Cox of Ohio, erecting a million-dollar newspaper plant on Biscayne Bay, told George Merrick one day that he could import from Spain more cheaply and expeditiously than he could buy in this country the tiles that pave and wainscot his Moorish counting room. The next day a man was on his way to Spain to buy tiles for Coral Gables.

Dr. Little, in the speech quoted earlier, made frequent and persuasive use of this form of expansion. This passage is characteristic:

Error and misconception have a feline tenacity of hold upon life, and the Fifth Estate [scientists], though richly endowed with latent executive capacity, is still, in popular opinion, regarded as equipped for thought rather than for action. The practical man, busily engaged in repeating the errors of his forefathers, has little time and less consideration for the distracting theories and disconcerting facts of the man of science. Yet who, among the men of action, is more intensely and truly practical than Carty, Baekeland, Reese or Whitaker? Where shall one find a firmer grasp on the details of business than that possessed by E. W. Rice, Jr., Gerard Swope or Dr. Nichols? What quality caused the young director of a research laboratory to find himself responsible for the production of gas masks to protect four million fighting men? In a time of dire emergency it was a professor of chemistry who organized the great Edgewood Arsenal and developed the means and methods and the trained personnel to supply munitions for a new type of warfare. It was not to a statesman or a business man or a great manufacturer that the Allies entrusted the supreme command. It was to a teacher in a French military school. The range and value of their public service obscures the fact that Charles W. Eliot was a professor of chemistry and that Hoover is an engineer.

Illustration. Sometimes a single example, amplified into a dramatic story, is more effective than several examples. It is remembered longer and recalls at once the general idea for which it is an illustration.

George L. Bell, in a talk on "Prospects in International Trade," gives us this:

It seems to me that we are confronted with the same sort of situation a banker in a small town might be confronted with—let's say any of the small

towns in the Middle West where they are dependent almost entirely upon the payroll of one or two large factories. If the factory burns down and the owner, unfortunately, had let his insurance lapse, he goes to the banker and if he can prove a good history of earnings, can prove that he has reasonable prospects of restoring his production and sales to what they have been, that banker will undoubtedly take on the loan. It will be not only to his interest to make profit on that one loan but by keeping the plant going, by keeping the payroll going, he is securing, or making better security, for his other loans in the community because the community could go downhill so far as income and business goes, if the factory discontinued operation. It is good business for the community as a whole; it benefits by getting that factory back into production. To my mind the United States, Uncle Sam, is in the situation of that banker. Western Europe has burned down and there is no insurance money. Someone has to provide the capital for rebuilding the plant and working capital to keep the thing going until the free flow of goods comes about again. That is, distinctly, a profitable venture for the United States, and I do not think we need to be ashamed to say it is because along with that self-interest, there is a real interest in the rest of the world. If we keep that large segment in the circle of international trade, every one of those sixteen countries will be better off and so will the countries with whom they deal in multilateral trade; in other words, we cannot have the big segment of industrial Western Europe eliminated and hope to restore international world trade.

Details. If you begin with "Saturday was a busy day for me," the listener expects you to mention enough details to give point to "busy." If you say, "Looking off the highest peak, I saw the city spread before me," the audience's natural query is, "What did it look like? What interesting landmarks did you see?"

A. D. Strong, in addressing the American Merchant Marine Conference, said:

As a result of the completion of this waterway, a surprising number of industrial improvements on the upper Mississippi river are taking place.

The audience silently asked, "What are they? Give details." Strong continued:

There are innumerable small developments such as grain terminals, oil refining plants, oil terminals, coal terminals, etc. The large coal companies

are giving careful study particularly to acquiring sites for large storage of coal to supply not only the consuming area adjacent to the river but the hinterland. New electric power plants are being built at Alma and La Crosse, Wis. The fuel for creating this electric power may be brought by river to these riverside plants. The Planning Commission of the State of Wisconsin is contemplating building highways to river ports so that the hinterland may be served by truck transportation bringing coal and petroleum from river terminals.

Proof. A paragraph of reasons, details, and examples may summarize the proof expected after an unusual or dogmatic assertion in the topic sentence.

There is no private house in which people can enjoy themselves so well as at a capital tavern. Let there be ever so greatly plenty of good things, ever so much grandeur, ever so much elegance, ever so much desire that everybody should be easy, in the nature of things it cannot be; there must always be some degree of care and anxiety. The master of the house is anxious to entertain his guests; the guests are anxious to be agreeable to him: and no man but a very impudent dog indeed can as freely command what is in another's house as if it were his own. Whereas at a tavern there is a general freedom from anxiety. You are sure you are welcome; the more noise you make, the more trouble you give, the more good things you call for the welcomer you are. No servants will attend you with the alacrity which waiters do who are excited with the prospect of an immediate reward in proportion as they please. No, sir; there is nothing which has yet been contrived by man by which so much happiness is produced as by a good tavern or inn.

JAMES BOSWELL, "Life of Johnson."

Cause and Effect. "Why is this?" commonly motivates a paragraph. Explanation, accounting for conditions and results, has a large place in every form of composition.

General Omar N. Bradley, in addressing an audience of magazine publishers on April 28, 1948, made telling use of this method of expanding an idea for conviction. He said:

At this time let us ask ourselves frankly if we are not stooping to a dangerous expediency with a checkbook plan for defense. Because it is easier to

write a check than to lend our sons to service, we have welcomed the opportunity to buy security at a reasonable price. We are bold in our clamor for national defense just so long as it pinches our pockets, not the careers of our sons. We may have forgotten that democracy—like all good things—requires men to serve it if they are to benefit by it. I fear the results of short-term checkbook thinking and I must candidly ask if this easy way is the right way; if this "cheaper" way will not prove costly in the event of another war.

I was taught to fight freely and liberally with machines in an effort to save the lives of my men. But at no time did these machines ever become a substitute for sufficient and well trained troops.

Today, in the face of every lesson of war, we are in danger of convincing ourselves by wishful thinking that we can purchase security by building machines less painfully than by calling on men and their spirit. Machines can certainly speed the winning of war and reduce its cost in human lives, but they cannot win a war by themselves.

Your armed forces have two missions of equal importance in the event of conflict. The first is to defend our homeland from enemy attack; the second, to strike at the enemy's heart. Our only certain and safe guarantee against enemy air attack is to seize and hold the bases from which his aircraft could fly. And in like fashion, the only certain and telling method of supporting an air offensive against the enemy's is to strike at him from bases where that attack can be sustained. To seize and hold those bases, for air defense as well as attack, that is the D-Day mission of your Army troops.

Without these bases resolutely held all the machines in the world could not save our cities from the ordeal of air attack. Ground units for such critical and demanding role cannot be developed overnight. They must be trained, disciplined, and conditioned—you can't use a butter knife for a scalpel.

Combination of Methods. You have no doubt observed that several of the illustrative paragraphs might have illustrated more than one method of development. Writers seldom say, "I will now write a paragraph of proof or of examples or of definition and restatement." They give, as a rule, little conscious attention to the nature of a specific type. They have purposes and results in mind and begin with what seem the readiest means. A word suggests details. A sentence, a moment later, needs restatement. The restatement still leaves the matter vague or life-

less, but the prodding "For instance?" animates it with an eager comparison or illustration. How and why we think what we think will probably always remain very much of a mystery. The will cannot completely control the progress of the thought. You should not try to force your theme into any of the channels indicated. Let it spread tentatively, experimentally, until it settles into the most available course.

In the following paragraph Hume summarizes a story of many years. Narrative usually follows a time schedule, tells things in the order they happened, but Hume combines with it definition, restatement, examples, cause and effect—all to build up proof for the assertion in his concluding sentence.

When Elizabeth came to the throne, the merchant navy of England engaged in lawful commerce amounted to no more than 50,000 tons, and the royal navy in commission consisted only of seven cruisers, the largest 120 tons, and eight armed merchant brigs. The navy was a mere skeleton; but the material was being formed in this period of depression from which England's future maritime greatness was to be built. The constant wars between Charles V. and the French kings had caused the English Channel to swarm with Spanish, Flemish and French privateers. Some bore letters of marque, some were mere pirates, but whatever they were, the sight of their easy gains and their adventurous lives fired the young English west country seamen, into whose ports they came. There were no sailors better than the Cornish and Devonshire men. Their voyages were the longest and roughest; for Falmouth, Dartmouth, Exmouth, Plymouth, Hideford and Bristol well nigh monopolized the over-sea traffic, excepting that with France and Flanders. The abolition of the fasts of the Church had immensely decreased the demand for fish, for the consumption of anything but flesh was looked upon as almost a sign of Papistry, and it was an easy step for the English sailors to rake up such a profitable trade as piracy in exchange for fishery. Vessels of all sorts passed into the business; younger sons of county families, and even sober merchants, were attracted by the gains; and soon anarchy reigned on the seas. The race was with the swift, the battle with the strong; and only the swiftest and the strongest survived. The stauncher, the handier, the quicker a vessel was, the greater was its chance of success; the bolder, the more hardy the men, the greater was their gain; and out of this welter there arose such a race of

seamen and shipbuilders as the world had never seen before. In the struggle for the survival of the fittest, Devonshire and Cornwall carried off the victory and when the supreme effort had to be made, which was to establish the sea power of England for good and for all, the stout hearts, the keen eyes, the matured experience of these scourges of the sea, were ready to fight in their country's battle.

MARTIN ANDREW SHARPE HUME, "Life of Sir Walter Raleigh."

The Filler. The weaver has his warp but can make no cloth without the "filling." Your few leading ideas are the warp of your speech, but they must be shot through and through with substantial and colorful strands of filler before they are ready to market. Experiment with the several types just considered. Dare to use them in your own way. Forms and formulas are not restrictive or exclusive. You may combine them in any manner that appears to you most effective.

Compare the synopsis of a play with the actual performance. As you read the program, or a newspaper account, you recognize that here are the same old materials. There are only about thirty original plots in the world. Some critics have boiled them down to two—two men and a woman, and two women and a man—yet there is no end of plays and stories, and there never will be. The shell may be the same, but the filler is always different. The particulars of place, character, incident, point of view, the reaction of each individual upon a given situation, vary enough to furnish the needed freshness and novelty.

Use of the Pen. The pen is a great clarifier, a chastener and an inspiration. It clears up foggy thought. Nobody has put this better than Abbé Bautain in "The Art of Extempore Speaking."

Writing is a whetstone, or flattening engine, which wonderfully stretches ideas, and brings out all their malleableness and ductility. If you have time for preparation, never undertake to speak without having put on paper the sketch of what you have to say, the links of your ideas. You thus possess your subject better, and consequently speak more closely and with less risk of digressions. When you write down a thought you analyze it. The division of the subject becomes clear, becomes determinate, and a crowd of things which were not before perceived present themselves under the pen. Speaking is

thinking aloud, but it is more; it is thinking with method and more distinctly, so that in embodying your idea you not only make others understand it, but you understand it better yourself, while spreading it out before your own eyes and unfolding it by words. Writing adds still more to speech, giving it more precision, more fixity, more strictness, and by being forced more closely to examine what you wish to write down you extract hidden relations, you reach greater depths, wherein may be disclosed rich veins or abundant lodes. Experience teaches us that we are never fully conscious of all that is in our own thoughts, except after having written it out. So long as it remains shut up in the mind it preserves a certain haziness. We do not see it completely unfolded, and we cannot consider it in all its aspects and bearings. Make your plan at the first impulse, and follow your inspiration to the end; after which let things alone for a few days, or at least for several hours. Then re-read attentively what you have written, and give a new form to your plan—that is, rewrite it from one end to the other, leaving only what is necessary, what is essential. Strike out inexorably whatever is superfluous. Only take pains to have the principal features well marked, vividly brought out, and strongly connected, in order that the division of the discourse may be clear and the links firmly welded.

The Nature of the Plan. Lyman Abbott's speech plan as quoted earlier in this chapter is a good standard pattern, but patterns are usually altered to fit specific persons and situations. What is the best order of the points or propositions by which to make the central point most convincing to the audience? What point should be brought up first? What last? What should be casually treated, what specially emphasized? Many speakers neglect to plan their opening remarks—a serious oversight. Others fail to give thought to the conclusion and trail off with tame and vapid endings. So whether your outline is long or short, formal or informal, whether you have it on paper or not, it should be made up under three main heads of introduction, body, and conclusion.

The Introduction. It is by no means enough to have the meat of your talk. You are not a chapter of a book, or an essay of impersonal instruction and entertainment. You are a person meeting and greeting other persons. If your first words lack the social touch, the warmth of a mutual recognition, you begin with a serious handicap. Introduce

yourself as well as your subject. Do not begin baldly, like an encyclopedia, without adequate preliminary remarks. The salesman carefully introduces his wares to the buyer with a few words of greeting and some specific bait for his curiosity. You are "selling" your audience a proposition. You wish it to "sign on the dotted line," that is, to give a vote for John Smith, or money for the new hospital, or approval of your plan for enlarging the factory, or merely indications of satisfaction with your talk. Notice what pains the writers of special articles take in finding plausible reasons in their opening paragraphs for soliciting the reader's attention to what is often intrinsically trivial or commonplace matter. They frequently fail to satisfy the curiosity they arouse in exaggerated or false leads, but they are ever on the alert for an excuse to talk. They always anticipate the question "Why should I stop to read this?"

Brevity and Individuality. You must have a similar forethought in setting the stage, in deliberately converting indifference into active attention. But you have one great advantage over the salesman and the newspaper writers. Your audience is waiting for you. You already have its voluntary, though more or less passive, attention. There should be little temptation to sensational, exaggerated, insincere beginnings. Whet the appetite with a pertinent anecdote or reference to the importance of your subject, or a few words of thoughtful greeting.

Remember that the chief purpose of the introduction is to create good will and interest. Modesty, sincerity, courage, and ease are reflected in the best openings. Simple, natural beginnings are most effective. Avoid the sophomoric elevation so common in young speakers and in orators. The grandiose, the philosophical, the smart, the studied effort, all suggest strain, insincerity, or vanity. Furthermore, this high-pitched introduction cannot be sustained with practical, convincing talk. There is an almost immediate sagging. The audience is misled and disappointed. Color, expansiveness, firmness, and animation the speech should have, but begin on a familiar level and rise. This is the order of suspense and climax.

On the other hand, mock modesty or apology cannot build up in-

terest. Do not tell the audience how unprepared you are. You will only depress or irritate them. They will either wonder whether they have come for nothing or suspect you of the usual dull and meaningless prologue. Tackle the job buoyantly, with an air of definite purpose and a desire to get to the heart of it with no more preliminary motion than is necessary.

Reference to the Audience or Occasion. There are many good ways of beginning. Examine the introductions of speeches and you will soon get the knack of establishing this sense of intimacy and expectancy in your audience. Notice that Chauncey M. Depew, for instance, never forgot that each case is individual. His first words always indicate this freshness of treatment. Though the speech may be in its outline one that he had given on many previous occasions, its introduction is full of specific references to this particular audience and occasion. Here is the way he began one speech:

> Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very much gratified to be present here with you tonight. Your invitation was an agreeable change from the daily health routine of a summer health resort, but I am at a loss what to say to you. What I do not know about fertilizer, and what you do put together would fill a library. I attended your business meeting this morning in search of points. From the addresses I gathered two ideas in the way of advice. . . . Certainly you have mingled business and fun in a way most instructive to tired workers in any line of life.

Do you regard Depew's remark, "I am at a loss what to say to you" as liable to get unfavorable response? He uses it, of course, to get a laugh in the very next sentence and to show how unrelated his talk will be to the business of the convention.

President Wilson made a speech in Boston, Feb. 25, 1919, upon his return from the Peace Conference in Paris. The introduction is simple, direct, and appealing. It creates a unity of intimacy and good will that would have been lacking had the President begun at once with an impersonal discussion of the controversies and politics of the Peace Conference. It begins as follows:

Governor Coolidge, Mr. Mayor, Fellow-Citizens: I wonder if you are half as glad to see me as I am to see you. It warms my heart to see a great body of my fellow-citizens again, because in some respects during the recent months I have been very lonely indeed without your comradeship and counsel, and I tried at every step of the work which fell to me to follow what I was sure would be your counsel with regard to the great matters which were under consideration.

I do not want you to think that I have not been appreciative of the extraordinarily generous reception which was given me on the other side in saying that it makes me very happy to get home again.

I do not mean to say that I was not very deeply touched by the cries that came from the great crowds on the other side. But I want to say to you in all honesty that I felt them to be a call of greeting to you rather than to me.

References to Other Speakers. The following extracts from their debate on the League of Nations show how skillfully Senator Lodge and President Lowell of Harvard observed the amenities of the occasion.

Your Excellency, Ladies and Gentlemen, My Fellow Americans: I am largely indebted to President Lowell for this opportunity to address this great audience. He and I are friends of many years, both Republicans. He is the President of our great university, one of the most important and influential places in the United States. He is also an eminent student and historian of politics and government. He and I may differ as to methods in this great question now before the people, but I am sure that in regard to the security of the peace of the world and the welfare of the United States we do not differ in purpose.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

Senator Lodge has been so long in public life and has rendered such eminent services, that I regard him not only as a statesman, but almost as an institution. For his ability and courage I have the highest respect, and I have usually been in accord with his opinions. Moreover, I have always been inconsistently Republican. But, although I suspect that we differ much less about a League of Nations than might appear on the surface, I cannot agree with his utterances, and still less with those of some of his senatorial colleagues, on the draft of a Covenant reported to the Conference at Paris.

ABBOTT LAWRENCE LOWELL.

Beginning on Common Ground. If you disagree with the majority of your listeners, begin on a note of agreement. Establish as large a common ground as possible. Respect opposing opinion and show the audience that you are perhaps not so far apart as they may think. You do not wish to triumph or show your cleverness or superior intellect, but to win cooperation, to discuss seriously but good-naturedly with equals a debatable question in the interest of truth and mutual advantage.

Owen D. Young in a speech on "Farm Electrification in New York State" takes pains to show this common ground at once. Notice how convincing his first words are:

Mr. Chairman and Gentleman: You have asked me to speak on the subject of supplying the farmers of the state of New York with electric service. I welcome the invitation, not only because of my great interest in the subject, but because I ought to have some qualification to speak on it. I was born on a New York State farm in a remote agricultural district, fifteen miles from the railroad. I worked on that farm until I was twenty-one years old. Out of doors we had no power except man-power, and natural horse-power, and indoors nothing but the grinding drudgery imposed upon my mother for unconscionable long hours every day. There were no milking machines; there were no power pumps; there were no silage cutters; there were no washing machines; there were no vacuum cleaners; there were no electric flatirons; there were no electric lights; there were no telephones; there were no automobiles; there were no radios. The weekly and semi-weekly newspapers were the communicators of intelligence. Muscles of human beings and horses were the generators of power and operated through the greater part of the year every day to the point of exhaustion. These are the recollections of my youth. For the last twenty-five years I have operated that same farm, and I do today.

Reference to a Dominating Issue. Sometimes conventional greetings are tame and futile. An audience may be tense, deadly serious about something, and wanting no introductory palaver. When Lincoln addressed the Republican State Convention at Springfield, Ill., in 1858, the threat of the Civil War hung heavy over the whole country. His opening remarks are famous:

Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Convention: If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it. We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." I believe that this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free.

Reference to a News Item. If you can relate your subject to some episode or event that has recently caught the attention of your audience, you can increase the sense of curiosity and suspense. You may also begin with a piece of news they haven't heard, something that may mean little to them but which you will make significant. A speaker in Boston made a good beginning with this:

This morning Boston University gave an honorary degree to Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the United Nations. He got the greatest applause I've ever heard in my thirty years of attending Commencement exercises. Now, Trygve Lie is a good man and he made a fine impression. But the applause was not chiefly for him. It was for what he stood for. He was the symbol of that hope, that yearning that everybody in that audience had for peace, for relief from the dread of war.

Beginning with a Question. This method is sometimes derided as played-out and insincere, but it still is used effectively. A question provokes reply, vocal or silent. It gets immediate concentrated attention. A speaker may begin with:

How many of you have ever written to a senator or congressman? (Waits for show of hands.) How many of you belong to an organization that studies bills in Congress and your state legislature for the purpose of promoting better government?

Beginning with a Quotation. A fitting and impressive quotation is dramatic in revealing the principle and the purpose of the talk. Sometimes it also serves as a good reason or excuse for presenting the sub-

ject. A speaker who intended to criticize the government began in these words:

"Where there is abuse, there ought to be clamor; because it is better to have our slumber broken by the fire bell than to perish, amidst the flames, in our bed."

This remark, my friends, was made by Edmund Burke, a great democrat of conservative temper. He knew we must make a noise about laziness, incompetence, extravagance, or corruption in government before we can hope for better conditions. He was not deceived by that cant about "constructive criticism."

Beginning with Humor: Story, Comment, Quip. A laugh is a wonderful solvent for a cold, clammy, critical audience—and a happy, informal way of getting at ease with everyone. Of course, the humor should be good-natured, in good taste, and relevant to the situation or the subject. Better than a "funny story" may be a pleasant sally at the chairman, the audience, the occasion, or yourself. See how these are illustrated in the following introductions:

Mr. Chairman and Friends: In my sixty years on the platform, I have been introduced by all sorts and kinds and conditions of men and women, but never in my life have I been frescoed and rubbed up and down and painted so vividly and multifariously as I have been by the chairman tonight.

CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.

Gentlemen of the City Club and Friends: I have been assured that I could use that phrase here, thus far from election. You are very hospitable people, as much so as they are in Pennsylvania. I was many years ago impressed with the fact that in Pennsylvania I was very cordially received on every day of the year except one, and I do not know of any place in the country except in Boston, where I have been more eulogized by Republicans between campaigns. It impressed me; and I was speaking one day over there, after a very gracious eulogy, and I remarked upon the fact, and I told them I could not explain the way they welcomed me in the state, knowing my views, except on the theory of a story I once heard. There was a very large man who had a small wife, and she used to beat him, and some one said, "Why do you allow it?" "Oh," he said, "it seems to please her, and it does not hurt me."

And so they seemed to welcome me over there, and just turned me loose on the theory that it might please me and would not hurt them. And I told them how discouraging it was for a Democrat to come into that state and talk as much as I did without converting people, and if it were not for an illustrious example in history I would probably have given it up. But I have been very much encouraged by the experience of Noah. It is said he preached righteousness for a hundred years and never made a convert outside of his own family. But at the end of the time a flood came and drowned all the Republicans. And so I go on talking, and I enjoy an opportunity such as is presented tonight.

WILLIAM JLNNINGS BRYAN.

Gentlemen: I am supposed to speak to you upon "The Poetry of Business, and Vice Versa." Now, it may be that I know more about the vice versa; and I am likely to get my talk mixed up, because, since I am of Irish descent, I defy anybody to hold me to my subject. Besides, I have heard before, more than once in Boston, and I think I could prove it if necessary, that I am related to that good old Irish priest who had one sermon, and only one. It was on the confessional. He was very anxious to preach, but didn't get much chance, because his brother preached in the church and knew his weakness. But the time came when his brother could not preach on a particular Sunday, and he asked if he could preach in his brother's church, and his brother said that he could next Sunday; but he said, "You have got to preach on St. Joseph, because it is St. Joseph's day." The following day he arose in the pulpit and said, "My dearly beloved brethren—This is St. Joseph's day. St. Joseph, you know, was a great saint. St. Joseph was the foster-father of our Lord. Now, St. Joseph was a carpenter, and carpenters make many things, among them, confessionals, and that brings me to my subject."

THOMAS A. DALEY.

Introductions of Talks by Students. In short talks before classes you will naturally cut down the introductions. You still give them thought as attention getters. You still need to answer the question, "Why bring that up?" But you can afford to deal more directly with your classmates. Come to the point as soon as possible. Some of the following beginnings may seem more practical.

Reference to Source of Material. Most of your talks will be suggested by your reading. What could be more natural than a beginning like this:

A few days ago I came across an article in *Newsweek* that disturbed me a good deal. The writer made a point that concerns every one of us.

Reference to Other Courses. Relate your talk to a common and familiar problem:

You're all taking accounting. Some of you think accounting is taking you and not doing you much good. This morning I'd like to advocate some changes in the curriculum and see what you think of them.

Reference to the Lack of Interest. Many speakers find this a stimulating way to introduce a topic that may, offhand, seem dull:

One of the most discouraging things about college men, it seems to me, is their lack of interest in politics.

Reference to the Background or History of the Subject. The historical approach gives opportunity for illuminating comparisons:

Twenty years ago a member of the State Legislature introduced a bill that was scornfully dismissed. It wasn't until yesterday that a bill identical in character was finally passed, and without a dissenting vote.

Disarming Reference to the Subject. Some topics always seem stale to students and they are inclined to greet them with at least a silent groan. The alert speaker anticipates this attitude and tries to dispel it in his opening remarks. He may say something like this:

You're tired, I know, of hearing how much good your college education is going to do you. You heard it your first day here and you've heard it ever since. Some of you will be hearing it again soon at Commencement, if you last that long. And now you're going to hear it from me.

But I'm going to be different. At least this may be the only time you'll ever hear a student make a speech about it.

Immediate Reference to the Purpose. Sometimes the best way to begin a speech is to state your business at once. The plain, blunt begin-

ning is often impressive because it suggests earnest, direct, concise discussion. This may serve as an example:

> This morning I want to talk about fraternities. Several charges have been brought against them, in this college, which I'd like to have you consider with me.

Beginnings begins to sound like a game to see who can make the longest list of possible varieties of opening remarks. It might be worth playing as a class assignment. It would help the students who are continually saying they don't know how to begin the speech. Their perplexity is a good sign. It shows that they are fully aware of the importance of getting off to a good start.

Body. The body of the talk has already been considered. It may be developed most easily in the chronological or time order, as in telling a story, describing a process, or narrating a series of events just as they happened. Perhaps a comparison or contrast between two persons or things or situations may give the desired clearness or emphasis. In exposition and argument an order of ascending interest, a climax arrangement, is common. But this means beginning with the least interesting, or least important, item and may conflict with the principle of emphasis that we have already mentioned. What we do in practice is to combine narration, description, exposition, and argument. The details involve illustrations, images, explanations, and proof. No matter what other qualities a talk may have, it should be clear and progressive. It should have a forward movement, not a revolving or aimless one. The best method of learning effective arrangements is to analyze actual speeches, to outline them and compare them with similar or contrasting plans. Glance again at the classic essentials of all good composition, oral or written.

Unity. Unity, oneness, requires concentration of ideas. A single purpose should give point to your talk. Below the title should be an implied demand: "Understand the land question of Mexico," "See the coal miner's life and problems," "Vote for John Smith." You do not put this so bluntly to your audience, but it is your central theme to which

every detail of your talk should contribute. Unity makes for conciseness and penetration. It makes no allowance for irrelevant talk.

In public speaking, however, the word *irrelevant* cannot be quite so strictly defined. According to the usual definition, it might seem irrelevant to begin with an amiable greeting that has nothing to do with the subject but which is effective in making proper contact with the audience. If that were true, speech would become depersonalized and would have little more warmth than the page of a book. Remember that for your purpose unity means more than being at one with your subject; it includes being at one with your audience.

This wider latitude of unity extends more noticeably to talks that aim simply to amuse. But the true unity should always be observed. When an audience is silently asking, "What's that got to do with the subject?" or "Why drag that in?" it is resenting the obvious lack of unity and condemns the aimless, purposeless filling up of time. Even the professional comedians, whose sole purpose is to get laughs, don't simply tell one joke after another. They carefully build up situations in which everything appears natural and to the point. Bob Hope relates—as well as narrates—his "gags" to the camp, college, or hospital that he is visiting. If no other place is available, there is always "Hollywood and Vine." Fred Allen selects a recent question of public interest for discussion in Allen's Alley. All observe Christmas, New Year's, Washington's Birthday, Valentine's Day, Thanksgiving, and so on, to get at least a superficial unity with the present mood or preoccupation of their listeners.

Coherence. Coherence implies clearness, orderly arrangement. This cohering or holding together is accomplished by means of good sentence structure and connections or transitional words and phrases, although these may often be profitably omitted in oral speech, because inflection and pause are clearer and more suggestive. The subtopics of your outline should be natural and logical supports for their headings. Coherence assures the straightforward movement to your conclusion and shuns the circling or side-stepping or getting off the track that inevitably betrays the planless talk. And, of course, a clear, simple, progressive order

of topics is a great help to the speaker himself in recalling a considerable variety of detail.

Emphasis. Emphasis is a matter of position and proportion. The advertiser will tell you that the outside of the back cover of the magazine is the best place to advertise—and the most expensive. The inside of the front cover and the two middle pages may be equally or more effective. Make your important point first or last. Give it enough space to set it off further from the rest. It may be best remembered if it comes at the end of a talk of steadily increasing interest. Or it may be better to speak of it at once and refer to it again in the conclusion. Display your wares to the best advantage. Here again a plan is indispensable to the careful speaker.

The Conclusion. Close your talk promptly but not abruptly. Many speeches trail off lamely and come to a dull and faltering end because the speaker has failed to carry through his preparation. He has let the conclusion take care of itself. He comes to it and cannot simply say, "That's all." His firm, well-poised words and manner sag. He circles about confusedly instead of winging straight to the end and, after several attempts to land, comes clumsily to earth and dispels the sense of mastery that the rest of his performance has given. Confidence in him is somewhat shaken. He is not so good after all.

In short talks the ending need not always be a formally marked-off conclusion. If you are telling how something is made or done, the last sentence of the body may be a sufficient conclusion. This is also the case with a narrative, an account of experiences. No sentences of good-by may be necessary. Just stop when you are through. The audience must feel, however, that you have brought the talk to a satisfactory completion.

Closing with a Summary. Thoughtful reading of speeches will make you familiar with several types of ending. The summary is one of the most common. An audience may be interested enough in a speech, but it sometimes gets lost in the details. It is liable to say at the end, "Now, what was all this about?" A short summary, a nutshell review, will remind them of the principal thoughts to take home. A summary has the disadvantage of repeating ideas, but this hazard can be minimized

by not repeating the language. The following conclusion, for instance, summarizes and at the same time makes more impressive the significant ideas of the speech:

So, communism is to be rejected—not because it seeks change, but because it seeks change in ways that are evil and self-defeating. I hope the day will never come when the American nation will be the champion of the *status quo.* Once that happens, we shall have forfeited, and rightly forfeited, the support of the unsatisfied, of those who are the victims of inevitable imperfections, of those who, young in years or spirit, believe that they can make a better world and of those who dream dreams and want to make their dreams come true. It is precisely to such that our institutions ought to appeal and to them, in the past, our institutions did appeal. As Lincoln said of our Declaration of Independence: "It was not the mere matter of the separation of the colonies from the mother land, but something in that Declaration giving liberty, not only to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance." That quality in our institutions once caught the imagination of people everywhere, particularly those who were dissatisfied, who were oppressed and those who sought a better world. They called what we were doing "the great American experiment" and we were to them "freedom enlightening the world." Americans were welcomed everywhere because, it was judged, they were working in a common human cause. We knew what we were doing, and why we were doing it, and the influence of our faith and works spread throughout the world, so that we had with other peoples a sort of spiritual alliance.

That seems to have changed. It is not because our institutions have failed us, for they still produce bountifully and they still work to effect peaceful change in the interest of enlarged individual opportunity. The trouble is that our understanding and our faith have lapsed. We take our institutions for granted and when they are challenged, we seek to defend them on false grounds. That is why, for the first time in our national history, we are on the defensive.

It is for such reasons that I express my concern over the nature of the education of our people. It is good to have technical learning and to push forward the frontiers of our knowledge. But that alone is not enough. It is necessary also to know the great deeds which our forebears wrought by faith; it is

necessary to have communion with the great crowd of witnesses with whom we also are compassed about. Then, and only then, can we run well the race that is set before us.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Closing with an Appeal for Action. It won't do to get an audience stirred up and then leave them without some attempt to answer their "What about it?" or "So what?" Do you want them to write, vote, give money, or "join up"? Give them some homework, a suggestion for further study, or a tentative solution that they may ponder and weigh with others. A businessman closes his speech with this:

I propose that we create a Joint Productive Clinic. We should launch the work of this Clinic along completely practical lines. This is not the time for abstract theories. The approach to this business problem must be made in a businesslike manner:

First: This Clinic should run some full-scale market research on the problem of productivity. We must find out what Labor and Management think about present techniques for trying to increase productivity. This vital area of opinion research has, up to now, been neglected. Yet we in business wouldn't dream of introducing new products without spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to find out what our customers think. Before introducing new plans to Labor and Management, let us find out what they both really think.

Second: Let the Clinic arrange a conference of the leaders of Labor and Management. This group should be assigned the task of formulating the methods and procedures we should employ to secure increased productivity. This would require agreement on the techniques of developing wage-incentive plans, the basis for selecting them, and their method of installation.

Third: Just as we use "test cities" for the testing of new products, so we should take our newly developed plans into a group of representative pilot plants. Here we can prove to all that satisfactory techniques have been well conceived in theory, and fully submitted to the acid test of operations.

Fourth: When this body of practical working knowledge has been fully developed, then let the Clinic put that information into *words of one syllable,* and sell it to Labor and Management from one end of the land to the other.

Fifth: Let the Clinic continue to operate as a sort of "Mayo Clinic," to doctor the productivity headaches of the American industrial system.

I know this is a large assignment. I can think of no group more qualified than you, who represent the trained intelligence of our production system, to give assistance to such an idea. It needs to be tested against your own practical experience and background. . . .

Ladies and Gentlemen, I believe in increased productivity. Without more goods we cannot lick the problem of a runaway inflation, and the berserk economy to which it may lead. Without more goods we cannot meet the triple demands made upon us by our expanding home economy, our commitments under the Marshall Plan, and the need to rebuild our military might. . . .

In the years that lie ahead, we need "togetherness" as we've never needed it before. If we *have* a togetherness of the spirit, a communion of purpose, the material power will come.

CHARLES LUCKMAN.

Closing with a Personal Opinion. Sometimes an objective analysis reveals weighty arguments on both sides of a question. The audience sees grave difficulties and is greatly perplexed by the issues. It naturally would like a personal opinion from a speaker whose insight and judgment seem acute. The opinion is likely to be optimistic and an appeal to the higher motives of the audience. Here is an example:

There are these days many gloomy predictions about the future, sometimes profoundly gloomy. It is, indeed, not uncommon to hear responsible and well-informed men foretell man's suicide, predict a cataclysm that will bring the end of our civilization in the not distant future.

I do not share this gloom, nor these forebodings of utter catastrophe. Of course, no man in his right mind can minimize the hazards of the gathering storm, or fail to see that troubled days and years lie ahead. I am sure there is no time to waste. But I have confidence that the philosophy of "Take Care of Number One" has so clearly been demonstrated a tragic failure that it will not be embraced again in your generation; that despite occasional (and quite human) relapses from time to time we shall not again be led down that road. More than that, I believe there is a good chance that we shall more and more apply in our daily affairs and public policies the moral precepts and ethical

standards mankind over thousands of years has learned, with such pain, may not be lightly ignored nor disregarded. I firmly believe that your generation intends to be and will become an active living part of your times.

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL.

Closing with a Quotation. A quotation is as good at the end of a speech as at the beginning. It is a prize package, a jewel of a thought for the audience to take away. It is a memorable summary and symbol. Here are the closing words of a fine dedication address:

This telescope is the lengthened shadow of man at his best. It is man on tiptoe, reaching for relevancy and meaning, tracing with eager finger the outlines of order and law by which his little life is everywhere surrounded. There is nothing which so glorifies the human race, or lends it such dignity and nobility as the gallant and inextinguishable urge to bring this vast, illimitable complexity within the range of human understanding. In the last analysis, the mind which encompasses the universe is more marvellous than the universe which encompasses the mind. "Astronomically speaking," said the philosopher, "man is completely negligible." To which the psychologist answered, "Astronomically speaking, man is the astronomer."

So we dedicate this instrument today in humbleness of spirit, but in the firm belief that among all the activities and aspirations of man there is no higher peak than this. There is a real sense in which Mount Palomar is Mount Everest.

RAYMOND B. FOSDICK.

Closing with Humor. "Exit laughing" is what you would like the audience sometimes to do if the laugh is with you and not at you. A witty remark, a humorous twist, a good story, may be just the right ending. It wouldn't have been appropriate for the conclusions given above, but in the following case it looks good:

I had not expected to say a word. I was like the fellow that died and went up to heaven after a very busy life and went in and picked out the easiest chair he could find and sat down and said, "Oh, I'm so glad to be here where I will not be worried any more. No more telephones, no more catching of trains." And he hadn't been there more than five minutes before he heard a

voice calling "Mr. Jones? Mr. Jones?" And he looked up and here was a very active little angel paging him. "Well, what do you want?"; and the angel said, "You are wanted on the ouija board."

C. J. Du Four.

Outlines. Your studies in English composition have probably made you familiar enough with outlines. You made them, as a rule, to satisfy your instructors. You regarded them, perhaps, as another form of academic torture, of little practical value. Students often write a long paper and compose the outline later, if it must be turned in. They go ahead without plan, trusting to luck that everything will come out in some reasonable order.

Now, it is true that for the usual writing and speaking you will never need the elaborate outlines sometimes demanded by teachers. They wish to get the picture of your composition at a glance; they want to know whether you have skill in orderly, logical, detailed presentation. But out of school most writers and speakers are likely to satisfy themselves with shorter, informal outlines. They may put down a list of places visited, or the names of the great men they intend to discuss. They may jot down three or four leading ideas to serve as reminders when they get to the platform. They may be so familiar with the subject that one word will suggest a train of illustrations that will take twenty minutes to tell.

Nevertheless, the beginner should make a sufficiently long list of heads and subheads to guide him in his rehearsal and practice. He will not, as a rule, memorize his speech, but he will silently reflect upon it, or talk it through to himself. For this he needs a fairly complete skeleton of the speech in front of him. He does actually memorize an order of key words and phrases upon which he extemporizes before an audience. He may bring to the platform only a cue card of three or four notes, but he is safe with these only after considerable rehearsal with his extended outline.

Suit yourself, then, as to the nature of the outline. Make it clear, of course, and see that it makes the most effective sequence of things you

wish to say. Perhaps what you intended to say last should come first. Maybe something you read in this morning's paper will make a good beginning and show at once the importance of your subject.

Outlines are tentative. They will be modified as fresh thinking and inspiration suggest. Even when they are considered final, unexpected circumstances may compel further revision. Other speakers at the same meeting may take too much time and leave only five minutes for what was planned as a half hour talk. Remarks by the chairman or others may invite appropriate comment. So your outline should be a flexible guide, not a fixed blueprint.

Examine the following outline and the speech by Mr. Knauth. Argument is made effective by establishing a common ground, by a concise and interesting statement of the facts from which the problems are discovered and the solutions offered. For another outline see page 243.

FUNDAMENTALS OF MERCHANDISING

By Oswald W. Knauth, Vice-president, R. H. Macy and Company, before The National Electric Light Association, June 6, 1928

Introduction

I. Courage of your association in asking me to discuss your policies.

II. Assurance of sympathetic reception.

Body

I. General problems of merchandising.
- A. Some definitions too simple.
  - 1. Special difficulties in electrical goods.
- B. Satisfying the customer.
  - 1. Encouraging him to return.
- C. Cost of distribution.
  - 1. Variations in rent, advertising, and peaks of selling.
- D. Size of stocks.
  - 1. Rapid turnover versus complete equipment.

II. Retail distribution in electrical industry.
- A. More or less complete line of articles.
- B. An indicated retail price for each of these articles.
- C. Special demonstrations for the particular pushing of each line.

D. Extensive advertising to build up a demand.

III. Disadvantages of the system.

A. Duplication of similar articles in several lines.

B. Difficulty of bringing customer to a choice.

C. Failure of demonstrators to play fair.

D. Practice of naming retail price in advance.

Conclusion

I. Sale of current chief object of electrical merchandising.

II. Question whether rival distributing system is best.

CUE CARD

1. Your courage
2. Definitions
3. Distribution
4. Stocks
5. Retailing
6. Demonstrations
7. Disadvantages
   a. Duplication
   b. Difficulty in closing sales
   c. Unfair demonstrators
   d. Naming prices in advance
8. Sale of current
9. Which system?

Your Association is to be congratulated for its courage in asking some of us retailers who are struggling with the problem of distributing the goods you make, to tell you our problems and how some of your policies look to us. You have already given ample evidence of wishing to meet our needs, so that I feel assured of a sympathetic reception, even though I know in advance that you will not agree with me.

To a merchant, the distribution of electrical goods is a part of distribution in general. The merchant, therefore, attempts to apply the same policies to the electrical goods that he finds successful in other goods, and I think that I can best begin by stating a few fundamentals of merchandising and then see how those merchandising necessities link up with the particular peculiarities of the electrical business.

I am always irritated when I hear a man say that the problem of merchandising is to have the right goods, at the right time, and at the right prices.

This statement makes it all seem so simple; and yet it is pompously enunciated as a profound truth over and over again. When we try to make a proper selection of electrical articles to offer our customers, we are confronted by a double problem. First, we wish to offer them a proper choice of toasters, urns, and flatirons, percolators, and so on, at varying prices and varying designs. But then we find that different customers also prefer different types of make, some of which are in complete lines and others cover only a few articles. If, therefore, we attempt to carry a complete line of each different make, we find that we have a tremendous confusion of choice and great difficulty in keeping in stock all of the items which we are carrying. Now, our object as merchants is so far as possible to help the customer in his choice, and to do this properly we must make the choice as easy as circumstances permit. Good merchandising would, therefore, demand one of two practices: either that we carry in one store, one complete line, or that we carry such items out of each line as we believe to be the best, the whole, of course, constituting a complete selection. I shall revert to this again.

Second, good merchandising demands the satisfaction of the customer in buying what he or she wants. An article must not only be sold at a profit, but also must carry with it a certain amount of good will, which encourages the customer to come back and keeps the store going next week and next year. Salesmanship should be directed to this end, and our whole policy of allowing exchanges and so forth is to insure the fact that our sales people do not oversell a customer. In order to accomplish this, sales people must be controlled by the store and must be definitely supervised from the customer point of view.

Third, the costs of distribution vary greatly. It is too often taken for granted that these costs are a definite, fixed per cent. In fact, I wonder if the costs of distribution do not vary as much as the costs of manufacturing. For instance, advertising cost varies from 1 to 6 per cent. Rent varies with the volume of business done in a given space, from 2 to 10 per cent. Selling cost varies with the possibility of sales in different locations, and with the excellence of service. Let me illustrate for a moment the causes for the variations in the cost of salesmanship: Every store does about double its average monthly business in December. Every store does a fraction of its average monthly business in July and August. Every store is much busier on Saturday than on any other day of the week.

Every store is comparatively empty from 9:00 until 11:00 and from 4:00

to 5:30, and very busy between 11:00 and 4:00. Now if we were to have enough trained sales people to take care of trade in December on a Saturday between 11:00 and 4:00, we must be tremendously oversupplied in July on a Monday between 9:00 and 11:00. Therefore, we must make some arrangements which will offset this wide hourly, weekly and monthly variation. We do it by means of daily part-timers, who come in at 11:00 and leave at 4:00; we have Saturday specials, who come in only on Saturdays; and along during the fall, we build up a surplus force to take care of the Christmas rush.

But at that we only do a partial job. Partial, because the irregularities are so spasmodic, and because we cannot pick up as expert sales clerks for such irregular intervals as we demand for our minimum business. You can see from this that every store must choose between great expense for selling and some degree of poor salesmanship, and the way in which each store chooses, brings about a particular character for that store and a comparatively high or low cost of selling. This cost of selling may vary from 3 to 10 per cent.

Fourth, the completeness of choice varies in different stores. Some stores have a policy of low stocks and rapid turnover. Others have a policy of carrying exceptional articles for exceptional customer requirements. It is easy enough to achieve high turnover, by keeping only such articles as are in normal demand. This means a low cost of storage, of inventory and ease of handling. It would seem to be the thing to do were it not for the sacrifice of good will when some customer demands some peculiar color or material or shape and has to go elsewhere to find it. That customer's normal trade is also likely to go elsewhere under these circumstances. Yet no store can afford to fill itself up with abnormal articles, for these rapidly turn into junk. Where to draw the line? This is the practical problem with which we merchants are faced, and it is as we answer this that we build up stores having different characters and having different rates of expense. These expenses are shown particularly in markdowns, which may vary from perhaps 2 to 10 per cent, but they are also shown through more or less expense of store operations.

Now let us look at the methods of retail distribution which you have built up in the electrical industry and see how they fit in with the demands of good merchandising. You have built up your systems on

1. More or less complete lines of articles
2. An indicated retail price for each of these articles
3. Special demonstrations for the particular pushing of each line

4. Extensive advertising to build up a demand for your particular articles and for your name in general

This system brings it about that you simply have to bring your articles into a store, be given floor space, and sales result. Prices are made, the demonstrator demonstrates, the public demands, and the supply is at hand. It is all very complete and very well worked out, and it is the easiest way for the storekeeper. And it works. Evidences of this are available at every hand. I need not go into this any further in such a gathering, for I know you are all familiar with it. I can therefore turn immediately to the problem of adapting this system to the necessities of good merchandising. I want to interject one remark at this point: that is, that the necessity of sound merchandising is far greater today than, say, twenty-five years ago. There are more good merchants in the field, and competition is infinitely more keen. We cannot afford loose methods or loose thinking if we are to stay in business—proofs of this are available at every hand.

Now, when your system is interjected into a store, it brings about several grave difficulties from a merchandising point of view:

First, it brings about a duplication of similar articles if several lines are carried, which really do not add to the customer's range of choice. This means more display space, difficulty of keeping in stock on the increased range of items, confusion in the stockroom, a multiplicity of many small orders. All this means that a store is apt to be sold out on its best-selling articles, and adds to expense generally.

Second, the difficulty of bringing a customer to a rapid and certain choice. Why this toaster against that at the same price? The more she sees the more uncertain she becomes. You attempt to meet this with your expert demonstrators, who can talk with conviction on the small conveniences and the hidden excellencies of different devices. But when several demonstrators demonstrate conflicting excellencies, the confusion of the customer ends in rapid flight.

Third, your extensive advertising certainly familiarizes the public with your name, and makes for ease of selling; unless the customer happens to bump into a rival display and demonstrator first. Then anything may happen. The demonstrator may play fair, and sell rival goods; or may enter into rapid super-sales argument; or may disparage the other line, and thus cast a doubt over electrical goods in general, from which we all suffer. All this

is impossible to control, and its evil effects are only too evident to those of us who watch it daily at close range.

Fourth, your practice of naming the retail price in advance. This is the easy way. But it is impossible from the point of view of really good merchandising. Partly, as shown above, because the costs of merchandising are not fixed, but widely different. More especially, however, because the naming of the best retail price is an extremely difficult matter, and cannot be done at long range. You gentlemen are experts in manufacturing, and you devote the waking hours of your life to these problems. But the problems of retail selling are very different, and it is my observation that manufacturers are not capable, by temperament or training, of dealing with these problems, any more than we merchants are capable of manufacturing. Often a very slight change in retail price will greatly increase the sales; often a slight change in display or location will bring about movement. Sometimes an increased selection, at other times a decreased selection, brings about added sales. These questions, together with the variations of costs, are the subject of our thought and experimentation during our waking hours. As a result of our training, we merchants are more capable of arriving at a correct solution than you can possibly be.

I come, then, to the conclusion that your system of selling is incompatible with the best merchandising practice. It may be effective for the small store in a small town. But it conflicts fundamentally with the necessities of large scale, economical and efficient merchandising practice, and a more effective way out must be found.

Before closing, I want to add a few remarks in regard to the burning problem of public utility retailing of electrical goods. I do not take this problem of competition as seriously as some of my colleagues, for it has been my observation that the public utility methods of merchandising are so clumsy that they cannot be a menace to us, in spite of their many advantages, as long as we are as expert as we must be. Moreover, this public utility competition is not a national problem, in that practices vary widely in different localities. Even were it dangerous, I cannot see on what grounds we, as retailers, can prevent public utilities from going into retailing, or attempt to dictate to them what their policies should be. As a matter of fact, their policies can often be compared to existing retail policies, even if these are unsound and unsuccessful policies.

But I do raise one question with all earnestness to those who guide public

utility policies. As I take it, you are interested in the sale of electrical goods, not for their own sake, but for the sake of increasing the consumption of current. If this is the case, would you not be wiser and more successful if you studied the question of increasing these sales through the existing retail organizations, whose outlets are widespread and well established, rather than add a single or several retail outlets, whose sales are an insignificant part of the total? Your present methods irritate and annoy the retailers who must make their living out of distribution alone. Why create this ill-will? Would it not be more effective to study how to help them increase their distribution, so that increased current will be consumed? And are there not greater possibilities of such increase than by setting up a rival distributing system of your own?

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Give a three-minute talk in which you review the content of a magazine article. Choose something in which you have already a lively interest, something which you can retell without trying to memorize it. Make an outline and be sure that you can amplify it in speech. Use the outline before the class if you wish, but remember you will soon be asked to get along without one.

II. Give a four-minute talk in which you urge the class to take action for or against some proposed public measure. Suppose that a vote will be taken.

III. Give a short talk in which you ask for contributions to the Athletic Association, the Red Cross, or to some other worthy institution or cause.

IV. Try to win the support of the class for your candidate in the coming city, state, or national election.

V. Discuss a referendum and urge the class to vote "yes" or "no."

VI. Bring to class an outline of a business talk. You will find abundant material in the reports and bulletins of conventions of bankers, engineers, manufacturers, salesmen, and others. Give a brief review of the talk and show how it violates or observes the principles of unity, coherence, and emphasis.

VII. Attend a lecture or speech and make an outline of the contents. Tell whether it conforms to the principles of good structure. Was the speaker verbose or incoherent? What was his aim--clearness, impressiveness, action, or entertainment? To what motives did he appeal? Did he draw illustrations from the experience of his audience?

VIII. Read in class the introductory paragraphs of four speeches and discuss the several methods of getting attention. Are they natural or strained? Is humor, anecdote, explanation, or any other device effectively employed? Are any of the introductions too long or too short?

IX. Make a similar study of conclusions. Give good examples of summary, question, or exhortation. Is the conclusion long, short, or simply the last paragraph of the discussion?

X. Make a study of speeches in the *Congressional Record.* (Congressmen are glad to put schools and colleges on their mailing lists.) Find specific causes for the reputed dullness of this class of speeches. Discuss purpose, argument, sincerity, and length. Find a good speech and give the reasons for its effectiveness.

XI. From the general subject "business," deduce at least six speech titles which show selection and limitation and which can be developed into satisfactory five-minute speeches.

XII. Let a committee of three students appointed by the instructor examine all

the titles submitted for assignment XI and post or distribute on mimeographed sheets the fifty chosen as most attractive.

XIII. Choose one of the fifty titles selected according to assignment XII and give a five-minute talk. Give the outline to your instructor before you speak.

XIV. Follow the procedure indicated in assignments XI, XII, and XIII for the general subjects "labor," "foreign trade," "transportation," "fuel," "improvements for city or state" and other subjects that suggest interesting and profitable talk.

XV. Try the following exercise for practice in impromptu speaking. Let every student write on a card or slip of paper one subject upon which every member of the class is probably somewhat informed. Let the slips be collected and distributed so that no one gets his own topic. Three minutes may be allowed the students to make a few notes. If a student knows nothing about the subject he should make a talk by asking a few pertinent questions, by treating the topic humorously, or by using it as a steppingstone to something else on which he can speak. Treat the exercise as a game in which no one may quit. The instructor should call on anyone at random. The student should stand before the class, put as good form into the assignment as possible, and not exceed three minutes. Everyone should have an opportunity for this practice.

Vary the practice by making it a little more challenging. Put the slips, face down, in a pile on the instructor's desk. The first student called takes up the first slip of paper, reads the title to the class, and proceeds at once to make a speech of not more than a minute or two. He may be excused as soon as the instructor sees that he has a definite core of thought to expand. The next student is then called to take the next topic.

XVI. Speak on one of the following subjects:

1. Changes in Merchandising Electrical Products
2. Regulation of Public Utilities
3. Department Stores
4. Part-time Clerk
5. The Five-day Week
6. Heating Fuels
7. Government Ownership
8. The Jargon of Finance
9. Business Machines
10. Press Agents
11. A Good Selling Letter
12. Patent Medicines
13. Synthetics

14. Ringing Doorbells
15. College Grades
16. Larger Immigration Quotas?
17. Operating a Restaurant
18. How to Improve Our Tax System
19. How Canada Looks at the United States
20. The Public Forgets
21. Slanting the News
22. Indian Chief
23. Roommates
24 The Tourist Trade
25. Marriage and Divorce
26. Washington "Run-around"
27. Sitting Pretty
28. Park Benches
29. Sightseeing
30. Island Bases

CHAPTER VI

WHAT AND HOW TO MEMORIZE

You should not, as a rule, memorize your speech, but you should do all you can to improve your memory, your ability to recall details. Everyone forgets, and every speaker sometimes regrets that he left the best part of his speech at home.

What Is Memory? In a larger sense, memory is inevitably the response to our deepest desires. What we care for we cannot forget. We are what we remember. In a beautiful passage of Darrell Figgis's "The Return of the Hero," Oisin says:

> For what are we, O bishop, but our memories? There is no difference between us but the differences of our memories. Nor may we ever be rid of our memories, for if we were rid of our memories we would then be rid of ourselves. Creatures of earth are we, O bishop, since we must ever carry with us the sights we have seen, and the sounds we have heard, and the things we have loved. Not one of these is lost, for they are we and we are they. Man is only the treasurehouse of his experience, and he cannot escape his destiny. For memory is fate, and fate is memory.

"The treasure-house of his experience" should serve the speaker well, but he must learn how to select, put in order, and display on call.

Extemporaneous Talks. There are occasions in speechmaking when passages or the whole of a short address may be memorized with profit, and it is well to consider how this may be done economically and effectively. But let us examine first the use of memory in the more common, more practical extemporaneous talk.

Impromptu Speaking. Don't mistake *impromptu* for *extemporaneous*. *Impromptu* means unprepared, speaking on the spur of the moment. Though students sometimes do this and get useful practice for

confidence and resourcefulness, you can imagine the results before a public audience. It is true that at discussion meetings a chairman may unexpectedly ask some person in the audience to make a few remarks, but it is because he knows his victim has something to offer, even though he is taken unaware. He has a lifetime of experience with the subject, he has spoken on it often, and the cues given him by other speakers prompt a pattern of familiar ideas. What he will say is not really impromptu at all.

Politicians and other persons in the public eye often appear to be making impromptu speeches, but they are never really unprepared. They know that their prominence may tempt a chairman to call on them, and sometimes they are disappointed if the call does not come. They are like salesmen with stock patterns, ideas, remarks, and stories always ready for a variety of common situations.

At dinners and other convivial meetings of societies, employees, and so on, some poor fellow who has seldom or never spoken in public may be struck dumb by the insistence of a joking chairman. He had better have the courage to grin and stay dumb than to rise meekly and be a laughingstock. But even in such a dismal situation one may do himself credit by applying one or two familiar formulas. Speaking not more than a minute or two, he may express his pleasure at being present at such a good dinner with such good company, he may speak courteously of other speeches that have been made, he may tell a story if he has the good luck to think of it in time. It will be better if it is relevant to the occasion, but it will serve if it gets a laugh. The occasion is playful and anything that adds to the fun is acceptable.

Genuinely impromptu speeches you will seldom make except in the intimacy of speech classes or clubs. You are concerned with *extemporizing* the speech after plan and preparation. You wish to converse with your audience, not to deliver a canned or memorized address, but you are wondering just how much you will be able to recall on the platform. Will you be cool enough and fluent enough to give more than your outline slightly expanded? Will there be flesh and blood enough on the skeleton to make a full-bodied, attractive talk? Some

speakers try to make sure of this by writing out the speech and memorizing it, but very few are successful with this method.

Don't Memorize. In the first place, it is almost impossible to memorize a speech well enough to give it without fear of forgetting. The speaker cannot let himself go. He talks at the audience instead of to it. His eye has an abstracted, far-away look. He has no ideas and is merely groping for words. He looks in, not out, and is not in touch with his audience, who soon detect his absorption and suffer a corresponding embarrassment. The speaker fails to impart his message. There is no real communication or practical expression.

If, on the other hand, the speaker is sure of "his lines," he is rarely a good enough actor to give the necessary illusion of spontaneity, of forging the language from ideas that are hot with enthusiasm and the desire to communicate. A hint of cold storage, of overelaborated preparation, is not compatible with directness and sincerity. If the speaker is not halting, he is usually glib or rapid or fails to pause or inflect as the speaker does who is actually creating and fitting the speech to the audience before him. Then, too, the language of a memorized speech is liable to be formal and bookish. It smacks of the essay, and its lack of conversational intimacy makes impossible the charm of extemporized talk. Of course, lecturers who give one speech before many audiences no doubt memorize their material. But this memorizing may have been unconscious and involuntary, just as the salesman's canvass finally becomes stereotyped and memorized. He gives it with as much dash and spontaneity, but the frequent repetition of thought and situation evoking the same response in language day after day finally gives him a pattern hard to avoid. Skillful actors, salesmen, and public speakers are conscious of this danger of mechanical speech in their routine and overcome it by added mental alertness.

You are not giving one speech over and over. You expect to make many speeches in the course of your business career, and make them at short notice with little special preparation. You can't afford the time, the labor, and the worry that go into the writing and rehearsing of a memorized speech.

Be Master of the Situation. The worst, the fatal, disadvantage of the memorized speech is that you are a slave to it. You can't change it once you step before your audience. Think of the many things that may happen to make changes advisable, even necessary. A change in the program, a change in the time allotted to you, the remarks of other speakers, the mood of the audience, a big news event—any or all of these may require additions, alterations, or cuts in your speech. You simply can't be at ease and at home with any audience. You can't be master of any speech situation if you are stuck with a memorized speech.

Advantages of Extemporizing. The fact is, public speaking must be as fresh and warm as conversation. You must be conscious only of the thought. You must be free to choose or reject words on the instant. This implies a preparation in which you have mentally gone through your speech or said it aloud to yourself a number of times, letting the words come as they will, as you would in discussing the items with someone else. Adolphe Thiers, the French statesman, used to discuss with his friends in the afternoon the subject upon which he was going to address the Chamber of Deputies in the evening. On the platform, after this kind of rehearsal, the argument, explanation, and illustrations are recalled so vividly in the order that you have considered them that they will speak out almost in spite of you.

None of us can do a thing like this exactly as another does it. We are subject to differences in temperament and training. Some cannot hold ideas clearly or follow them through their details unless they write them out pretty fully, and this is very helpful if you do not try to memorize the individual words and phrases. Others prefer to walk about and talk to themselves, outline in hand. Sitting quietly and talking silently to an imaginary person or audience is recommended. Francisque Sarcey, one of the most popular French lecturers and critics, gives some interesting and suggestive advice in his book "Recollections of Middle Life." He says:

> Get up and walk—The movement of the body lashes the blood and aids the movement of the mind. . . .

Force yourself to improvise. Do not trouble yourself about badly constructed phrases, or inappropriate words—go your way. Push on to the end of the development, and the end once reached, recommence the same exercise, recommence it three times, four times, ten times without tiring. You will have some trouble at first. The development will be short and meagre; little by little around the principal theme there will group themselves accessory ideas or convincing facts or pat anecdotes that will extend and enrich it. Do not stop in this work until you notice that in this taking up the same theme you fall into the same development and that this development, with its terms of language and order of phrases, fixes itself into your memory. For what is the purpose of the exercise I recommend to you?

To prepare you for a wide and fertile field of terms and phrases upon the subject that you are to treat . . . a considerable number must be accumulated in advance; it is a store of ammunition with which you provide yourself for the great day. [Before your audience you will find that your mind] draws from that mass of words and phrases accumulated beforehand, or rather that mass itself is set in motion and runs toward it and carries it along, it follows the flood, it has the appearance of improvising what it recites, and in fact it is improvising even while reciting.

There will come a time when, even with themes that are new to you, you will no longer need, in order to establish the development, ten or twelve successive improvisations. In a few hours, spread over two or three days, you will get through the preparation on condition, be it understood, it is a prime condition, of fully possessing your subject.

What May Be Memorized. Now that you realize that you must get skill with the extemporaneous method if you are to become a good speaker, you may toy a bit with some minor projects in memorizing.

The Beginning. Many speakers memorize their opening remarks. They know that audiences are always most curious and attentive at the beginning of a speech. They "size up" the speaker at once, judge him in his first words, and decide whether he is going to be good or bad. A thoughtless, slipshod beginning may suggest, perhaps quite erroneously, that the speaker will be a bore. So the careful speaker looks for bait to catch the audience at once. He plans an arresting, challenging, or humorous opening.

He memorizes this but always with the reminder that he may have to discard the whole introduction by the time he actually addresses the audience. Something else may suddenly appear more appropriate. If he can keep those good lines without having them seem artificial, he naturally will, though he may have to put the actual beginning ahead of them.

The Conclusion. The conclusion may be memorized more safely than the beginning, because there is seldom need to change it. And it is comforting to know just where and how to conclude. You get to the finish just ahead of the audience. Instead of the halting, experimental, indecisive attempts to end the speech while the audience has its collective hat in its hand, you make a quick, neat, unabrupt close that will give the audience the necessary favorable last impression.

Introducing Speakers. A short speech that may be memorized, always with the overtones of the extemporaneous style, is the speech of introduction. As this type of speech should rarely be more than two or three minutes long, its impressiveness comes from its courtesy, grace, emphasis, humor, or sense of personality. The language, though more precisely written out, should still have the informal, spontaneous rhythm of talk. Thoughtful delivery, at a deliberate rate of speaking and punctuated with sufficient pauses, will enhance the illusion of "first-time utterance."

Other Short Speeches. In presenting a gift, in speaking a few words of commendation, in replying to a presentation, in every situation where brevity, precision, and style count for most, the few necessary remarks may be memorized to advantage. Audiences will not, in so short a period, discover the "canned" or transcribed nature of the talk if the language is not noticeably formal and heavy and if the delivery is friendly and appropriate. In all this, the speaker is, you see, something of an actor. His lines have been rehearsed but must sound unpremeditated. They should have the broken rhythm of conversation, not the even regularity that betrays the unskilled reciter. More about this element of timing will be said in the chapters on voice, on radio speaking, and on reading a speech to the audience.

Training the Memory. No matter whether the talk is impromptu, extemporaneous, or memorized, you still need a good memory. Notes and reminders are only cues to many other things you must recall, and it is this factor of recall, whether of a name, a face, an idea, or a story, that everybody wishes he could improve.

You wish you could, like the man in the advertised memory course, walk right up to the chap who is eyeing you with a doubtful look, and say:

> Ah, Mr. Adelbert Sturtevant, it was just sixteen years ago Thursday that I saw you last, in the Hotel Astorritz, in Swartzville, Nevada. I hope your wife got over the grippe soon. Are you still selling for the Ironton Lumber Company?

Or you may wish you had a memory as tenacious as that of the celebrated Indian of the north woods, who was famed, according to the story told by E. E. Whiting in the *Boston Herald,* for never forgetting anything.

> A visitor to the region tried him out: "Chief, you claim never to forget anything. Tell me, what did you have for breakfast New Year's Day seven years ago?"
>
> "Eggs," said the Indian.
>
> A year later the same man met the same Indian and thought he would try him out again. He approached him Indian fashion:
>
> "How!" he said, extending his hand.
>
> "Fried," said the Indian.

You can without doubt greatly improve your present powers of recognition and recall. In every act of memory the basic principles are attention, association, and repetition. Get the habit of deliberately practicing all three in every attempt to memorize. If names and faces are important to you, study systematically the appearance of every person you meet. Associate him definitely and clearly with the circumstances and place of meeting. Repeat his name several times during the conversation and write it later, with associating items, if you think it is worth while. We learn everything in connection with something else.

Nothing has meaning of itself alone. We relate it, associate it, with some former or attending experience. The bank clerk or the hotel clerk takes pains to make as many associations as he can in connection with his patrons. He studies hats, eyeglasses, noses, stickpins, neckties, clothing, companions, names, and handwriting on checks or registers. The student associates dates with events, persons, and places. He creates a setting, a related background of circumstances.

Memory Systems. Professor Pillsbury, in "The Essentials of Psychology," has two very interesting paragraphs headed "The Best Methods of Remembering." They are quoted here to show that "short cut," artificial systems are actually more difficult and less effective than natural and logical methods of memory-training:

Since the ancients many attempts have been made to find easy and certain ways of learning and remembering, and in all ages there have been individuals who profess to have methods for improving the memory. All of these attempt to make use of special methods in forming associations. They fall into two general classes,—methods of learning single things such as dates, and methods of connecting two facts or events that it is desirable to remember together. Systems for remembering single events attempt to connect them with symbols that will be more easily remembered. Numbers are remembered by representing each digit by several consonants and then making words that include these consonants. Thus one may represent 8 by *f*, 7 by *g*, and 1 by *t*. Then one can recall that Alfred came to the throne in 871 if the burned cake suggest fagot, a symbol for 871. Similar combinations could be made to represent any date or number, and the word is easier to remember than the number. Where two events are to be connected in memory, it is possible to form nonsense or superficial connections between them that shall serve to recall one when the other is given. In one system it is suggested that one may remember that *tête* in French means "head," by connecting *tête* with "potato"; that in turn with "root," since potatoes are roots, and this by contrast with "head." Similar series of words are suggested for many other pairs, and the system consists in forming them for all series of facts. It is certain, however, that when used extensively, any such system requires more effort and is less satisfactory than the ordinary means of learning. . . . Mnemonic verses and similar devices have some value in remembering a few purely arbitrary facts,

such as the number of days in the months, but the usefulness of the system does not extend far.

The best mnemonic system is the ordinary logical system of classification. The connections are not arbitrary here, and each series of associates holds not for one fact alone but for very many. In one sense, the classifications of the sciences are parts of a vast mnemonic system. For each general principle groups many facts about a single statement. Since the general principles are themselves more or less closely connected, they amount in practice to a system of associations in which a few things, if they are remembered, will serve to recall all the knowledge of the individual. As we have seen, this system of knowledge, when it has been developed, makes easier the learning of all things referred to it, makes their retention more permanent, and by giving them a place assures their recognition. It follows that the more one knows, the better is one's memory, the more one knows of any subject, the easier it is to learn new facts in that subject. Much better, then, than any artificial memory system is a patient, thorough learning and logical classification of facts. This not only makes easy the learning and retention of the fact in question, but prepares for the acquisition of related facts. Learning logically is like putting money at compound interest. The material is not only saved, but grows and makes easier further acquisition.

Adult's Memory Better than Child's. The adult, contrary to general belief, has greater capacity for memory and learning than the child. His larger knowledge and experience enable him to make more associations for every new fact. It is only in old age, when the central nervous system begins to show signs of decay, that the power of memory weakens. The child has an apparently better verbal or rote memory only because, like the actor, he has kept alive the habit of associating words and ideas. His teachers have compelled the necessary number of repetitions to make memory enduring, and the child's natural lively pleasure in rhyme and jingle have made possible the necessary concentration.

The Whole Method. Public speakers have considerable need of a good rote memory. Occasionally it is desirable to memorize a speech. More often one wishes to quote a passage of prose or poetry. How can the thing be most economically learned? Almost everybody goes at

it line by line, stanza by stanza. This is the longest, least effective way because, as Pillsbury says,

> . . . one makes a number of unnecessary and misleading associations between the ends and the beginnings of lines that both waste time and interfere with the correct associations. Then, too, learning by parts leads to the repetition of the first portions more frequently than is necessary, since they are repeated with each of the later parts.

Read the passage carefully from beginning to end to get first the general ideas. Then read it again, noting the character of the illustrations, the specific references and examples. Read it again for the peculiarities and meanings of the individual words. Your first readings, then, should be concerned with the meaning of the passage, the meaning as a whole and in its details. Continue with this method of reading the entire passage at one time, studying the association between words and meanings. Note beginnings and ends of sentences, lines, or stanzas, but do not repeat until you have read the whole passage. This method is at first difficult to follow because you are not used to it and because it does not show immediate results. But at the end of a half-dozen repetitions you may suddenly find that you can recite the passage with ease. Perhaps you will need a dozen or twenty repetitions. This of course depends on the nature and length of the material. It is advisable to repeat the more difficult passages more frequently than the easier ones. This sounds like a compromise with the old discredited method of learning bit by bit, but is radically different because it discriminates, goes as soon as possible to the words that need added drill, and avoids unnecessary repetition. Hollingworth and Pfoffenberger in "Applied Psychology" recommend the "whole method" for this reason:

> Begin by doing a thing as nearly as possible in the way it is eventually to be done. . . . Otherwise it must not only be relearned in parts, but old habits must be broken.

The actor uses this method. He reads his part several times before paying too close attention to details. He rehearses with the company for several days reading from his typewritten pages, noting the mean-

ing and the "business," the action, of his part as they are related to the other parts of the play. Then he discards his text and tries to go through his part with occasional help from the prompter. Certain passages are a little tricky, the sentences have unusual structure or words, the cues come at unexpected moments or places. He gives these items special study until he is "letter-perfect."

Distributed Repetition. This procedure implies another factor in economical memorizing, that of distributed repetitions. Do not try to learn an extended passage in one study period. You will memorize much more effectively by distributing twenty repetitions over five days than by doing them all on one day. The result will be still better if you repeat the passage twice a day for ten days. It seems to take time for the effects to "set" in the nervous system. For this reason psychologists also advise that no other mental work be done until five or ten minutes after the memory drill.

Physical Activity. Moving about is ordinarily a great help in memorizing. Many persons instinctively leave their seats after a few moments of study and walk up and down and around the room. Comfortable unconscious action of this sort promotes greater concentration not only in retaining matter, but in composing it as well. The country folk soon got used to Wordsworth as he strode along the lanes of the Lake District and boomed out the verses that later made him famous.

Public speakers sometimes lose the thread of a discourse and in their panic cannot think of a word. The most practical device to recall confidence and memory is to walk across the floor, to take a few steps in any direction. This breaks up the frozen attitude of body and mind and usually releases at least one idea that will carry the speaker along until he finds himself. But loss of memory rarely happens to one who has an outline of a few leading ideas coherently and naturally arranged. He is on familiar ground, where every step brings cues and reminders. Lapse of memory may happen at any time to one who consciously tries to recall, one by one, hundreds of individual words.

Do not try too hard to recall names or ideas. It is like trying to force yourself to sleep. Relax and think of something else. "Let them alone

and they'll come home." The desperate intensity which everyone has experienced seems to induce only a kind of rigidity in which thought stagnates or fails to function. That kind of hard thinking is really not thinking at all. Give it up. Go on to another matter and presently the lost idea, unbidden, comes rushing in.

Rate of Forgetting. Rote learning, to be retained, requires frequent reviews. We forget most the first day after memorizing a passage, and continue to forget as time goes on, but at a constantly diminishing rate. The authors of "Applied Psychology" cite this test:

> The laboratory experiment which indicates the slowest rate of forgetting shows that of a poem learned well enough to be repeated correctly twice immediately after learning, over 20 per cent will be lost in twenty-four hours; while at the end of thirty days only 76 per cent will be lost. These figures mean that in a period thirty times as long, less than four times as much of the material is lost.

Recalling Stories. If the speaker could only recall when he most needs them two or three of the hundreds of good stories he has heard! The fact is, he has seldom given them enough association and repetition to make this possible. His initial oversight was fatal. He failed to recognize the story as speechmaking or social capital for himself. He should have seen its availability, noted its key words and associations, repeated it as soon as he had opportunity, and continued to tell it occasionally.

Most of us have not a sufficiently strong or enduring interest in storytelling. It is only in emergencies that we give the subject active thought. The "born" storyteller not only likes a story, but he likes to tell it. He looks for opportunities and gives himself considerable practice. He forms many associations and cues for the recall of his favorites. His concentration on the story begets, however, correspondingly weak memory for listeners. He forgets that he has told the story a half-dozen times to the same person or audience. But he has a batch of stories when he needs one.

Many professional speakers have files of stories. They clip them from all sources and write out good ones they hear. A simple index of headings like *perseverance, laziness, optimism, fear,* and other qualities

of character, or one composed of names of persons, states, nationalities, makes it possible to find the appropriate thing without difficulty.

The simplest and most practical plan is to keep a folder or box of a few live stories. Most of the things we file soon grow stale. Nothing is more depressing than to go through a mass of stuff one has systematically put away for future use only to find that it had better be thrown into the wastebasket. Stories do not age as quickly as most other material. At least old age is not necessarily fatal to them. Some, indeed, seem to grow more popular with the years. Agnes Repplier in an essay on humor contends that all jokes are variations of ten or eleven original sallies that were probably known to Noah, Moses, and Aristotle and are still favorites. But stories go in and out of fashion, and it requires a somewhat sophisticated mind to know what will "go" at a given time and occasion.

The Will to Remember. It cannot be too strongly urged that there must be an incentive, an active, purposeful desire to remember, if the memory process is to be completed. There are comparatively few adults who can recite promptly and correctly one stanza of "The Star Spangled Banner" or "America." Everybody has sung both songs hundreds of times, but scarcely anyone tries consciously to learn them. Ten minutes of deliberate interested study of the words and their associations, and a few careful repetitions, would probably be sufficient to master either of them, or, for many persons, both.

Memory Grows with Knowledge. Darwin used to deplore his poor memory, but no man ever had a more capacious memory for the facts of his science. He remembered little of literature, art, and other subjects that he was wont to regret his ignorance of, because he was not actively interested in them. His absorption in the studies of evolution left him no reserve for other matters. But his great familiarity with this field, his hundreds of classifications, the thousands of details that were associated with each, the innumerable comparisons, experiments, and repetitions, made such a setting for every new fact that it was almost impossible for Darwin to forget it.

The more you know, the more you remember. You may not re-

member much about the dates, causes, and sequence of battles after a single reading of Grant's "Memoirs." Read next Page's "Life of Robert E. Lee" and you begin at once to make interesting comparisons, associations, and repetitions with variety, all brought over from the "Memoirs." After this second reading you remember not merely twice as much, but perhaps six or seven times as much about the Civil War. Continue your study of that period with a book by a modern writer who has a more detached, impersonal view than the actors in the drama, and your interest and memory for details will grow in an even larger ratio.

Memory must have something to feed upon. Meager backgrounds are barren of sustenance, and that is why students often do so poorly in trying to make a speech out of a magazine article. They have no active interest in the subject, they have read nothing else about it, and they have no experience, associations, and comparisons to nourish and enrich the recollections of what they have read. But it is encouraging to see how often a strong initial impulse creates a self-sustaining interest that lives and grows with little conscious effort.

Attention, association, and repetition are the steps to memory and learning. In logical memory, the memory of reason and reflection, the repetition of principles or general ideas must be accompanied by variety, that is, different illustrations, examples, or proof. Attention can be held only by a change of perspective, as you will observe in the chapter on the Psychology of Public Speaking.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Write out, memorize, and deliver a short speech introducing the governor of your state to a college assembly.
II. Memorize and give a short speech presenting a set of books to an honor student.
III. Recite a monologue from "Macbeth," "Hamlet," or "Julius Caesar."
IV. Recite one of the following passages with ease and intelligence:

1. If stores of dry and learned lore we gain,
We keep them in the memory of the brain;
Names, things, and facts—whate'er we knowledge call—
There is the common ledger for them all;
And images on this cold surface traced
Make slight impression, and are soon effaced.
But we've a page, more glowing and more bright,
On which our friendship and our love to write;
That these may never from the soul depart,
We trust them to the memory of the heart.
There is no dimming, no effacement there;
Each new pulsation keeps the record clear;
Warm, golden letters all the tablet fill,
Nor lose their lustre till the heart stands still.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

2. Johnson had said that he could repeat a complete chapter of "The Natural History of Iceland," from the Danish of Horrebow, the whole of which was exactly (Ch. lxxii., *Concerning snakes*) thus: "There are no snakes to be met with throughout the whole island."

JAMES BOSWELL, "Life of Johnson."

3. The atrocious crime of being a young man, which the honorable gentleman has with such spirit and decency charged upon me, I shall neither attempt to palliate nor deny; but content myself with wishing that I may be one of those whose follies may cease with their youth, and not of that number who are ignorant in spite of experience.

WILLIAM PITT, "Reply to Walpole."

4. Remember thee!
Ay, thou poor ghost, while memory holds a seat
In this distracted globe. Remember thee!
Yea, from the table of my memory
I'll wipe away all trivial fond records,

All saws of books, all forms, all pressures past,
That youth and observation copied there,
And thy commandment all alone shall live
Within the book and volume of my brain.

SHAKESPEARE, "Hamlet."

V. Speak without notes on one of the following topics:

1. Literary Slumming
2. Spy Rings
3. Communist Propaganda
4. The Theater
5. The Skeptic's Corner
6. Dietary Fads and Fancies
7. Joe Miller
8. Nature and the Truth
9. The Soapbox
10. My Home Town
11. Who Are the Liberals?
12. Slave Labor
13. Chiropractic
14. Good Housekeeping in Factories
15. Fire Prevention
16. Mental Hospitals
17. The State of the Union
18. Marks of an Educated Man
19. Allergic to Study
20. Consumer Credit
21. Steel
22. Backlogs
23. Working for the Government
24. The United States Supreme Court
25. Coal Reserves
26. Do More Than Expected
27. Real Estate Loans
28. Training Assistants
29. Double or Nothing
30. Killing Time.

CHAPTER VII

BEFORE THE AUDIENCE

If we could prepare the delivery of a speech as coolly and methodically as we can the substance, our problem would be greatly simplified. Some try to do this very thing by rehearsing a memorized speech, but it has been shown that this attempt to discount the terrors of the platform usually defeats its laudable purpose. Delivery is largely a matter of personality, and because this quality is so difficult to analyze and even more difficult to alter, many intelligent speakers think it is a waste of time to give it their attention. They are thankful for the ability to find something to say. They get up to tell it to an audience as they would to a neighbor. Sometimes they succeed. But the conversational manner is not ordinarily sufficient. The manner must be heightened. A conversational tone may be indistinct or harsh or monotonous, and the speaker's manner may lack authority and energy. His speeches read well in the newspapers but leave the audiences indifferent or impatient at so intelligent a speaker's lack of impressiveness.

Completing the Meaning. To urge the student to take pains with his delivery is not enough. He must have definite ideas about what constitutes good presentation. He must get the habit of appreciating differences in enunciation, manner, gesture, quality, and modulation of voice. He must ask why this or that is effective or ineffective. The technique of delivery, whether easy or difficult, is just as essential to the speaker as to the actor. Both must put the breath of life into words—literally "inspire" them with individual meaning. "Logical content," the surface or general meaning, is a comparatively vague abstraction; it must be given body and direction by the "personal intent," [1] the accent and

[1] See C. H. Woolbert, "The Fundamentals of Speech," p. 299. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1920.

action of the speaker. How many interpretations may be drawn from the same words. What do the words "They come" mean? Do they imply a defiant "Let them come!" or a relieved "Ah, here they come," or a triumphant "I told you so," or a joyous welcome, or an incredulous "I don't believe it," or a resigned "I'm prepared for the worst"? Only the speaker's looks and the color and inflections of his voice can tell. The eye, the body, and the voice may combine to give twenty widely varying meanings to the word "yes." Thought and language by no means complete the picture. Tone and action say a great deal in every case. They either contradict the words or supplement them with needed detail and vitality. The point is, they cannot be neglected. If they are not controlled and energized, they make a speech of their own which conflicts with what the speaker is trying to express.

In the theater poor scenery is worse than none. It only distracts the audience and creates bewilderment, disappointment, and ridicule. In the absence of scenery the playgoer creates some out of his own fancy, an idealized setting which harmoniously completes the illusion made by the players. Similarly in reading a speech one visualizes the situation and the speaker in his own fashion according to his understanding and temperament. He has time to deliberate upon the meaning of the words, he can reread and reflect and make something out of it all to repay him. At least his imagination is free to construct what it can from the words. This is not the case when he hears the actual speaker. His imagination is arrested, and he is confined to the picture actually presented. A good speaker will greatly enrich the picture without violating the essentials a careful reader might have got from the printed page. A poor one will correspondingly limit and distort the meaning.

Very few of us can read a play with much pleasure. We simply cannot make abounding life and drama out of printed pages. The specialist, the one who has brooded over the lines and wrung from them their hidden suggestion and thrill, does that for us. And so it is usually with a shock of surprise, delight, and mortification at our own dullness that we see a company of competent actors reveal the playwright's passion and humanity.

The public speaker likewise has the responsibility of interpreting himself aright by alert and discriminating variety in voice and action. His art must create an impression of sincerity, vigor, competence, and authority. All this is usually taken for granted, and that is just the trouble. Take it out of the subconscious and give it your conscious attention until right habits are fixed. Then let it slip back as every artist does.

The Use of Notes. Perhaps the first question that faces the beginner is the use of notes. Try to get along without them. Every audience prefers the speaker who comes forward without notes, papers, helps of any kind. It likes to feel that he speaks from a deep well of knowledge and experience. It is his suggestion of reserve power that makes him impressive and that indicates the leadership his listeners wish him to have. Even if a well-known authority is speaking, his influence is weakened by the presence of notes. They suggest superficiality or formality or lack of confidence. The gentleman conversing easily and interestedly does not need notes.

There is a still weightier objection to the use of notes before an audience. It compels the eye to leave the audience and seek the paper. Now the eye is the most eloquent part of the speaker. It gets the attention and holds it. Looking at the floor or the ceiling or out the window, anywhere except into the faces of your audience, is fatal. "I'd like to know why Prexy is always looking at me," one college freshman is reported to have said. "That's queer," retorted the other, "I thought he was looking at me." [1] This sense of individual searching and questioning is necessary. The eye has a magnetism. It induces the current of sympathy. Do not break the spell by looking away at a paper. No matter how quickly the eye returns, the crowd unity, that absorption of the individual by the mass, is gone. The individual minds have relaxed, the attention has been caught by irrelevant matters, and the speaker must begin again the more or less difficult task of creating a sustained interest.

Short talks before a class are not hard to manage without notes.

[1] See J. A. Winans, "Public Speaking," p. 39. Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1917.

Your preparation will have given you ample material arranged in a very definite form so that you can easily recall it with the aid of a few cues. These leads are the main headings of your outline. There ought not to be more than three or four and they can be readily memorized.

If you still think you will be more comfortable and confident with written reminders for support, set down on a small card the few headings and subtopics that are vital—and write them so that you can distinguish them at a glance. As you step forward to begin your talk place the card on the table or stand, and forget it. If you should happen to need it, which is not likely, turn coolly to the card—pick it up, don't bend over it—and examine it leisurely. If you hold it in your hand, you will be nervously and uselessly looking at it every moment and will spoil your talk. It is better to keep your card of notes in your pocket where you cannot get at it readily.

Do not be discouraged if you are slow in acquiring this greater confidence in yourself. You can make a good talk with notes, as many speakers do, if you use them as sparingly as possible and aim to put them aside altogether. Of course, statistics and quotations more than a line or two in length must be read or their genuineness will be doubted, but even though they carry added conviction, they may still be considered a necessary evil.

Before You Are Introduced. With this caution, let us follow chronologically, as far as possible, your course during a single platform experience. You are under fire the moment you step on the platform. While you are seated waiting your turn to speak, the audience is keenly judging you. "What you are speaks so loud," said Emerson, "that I can't hear what you say." Thoughtfulness at this time will create so favorable an impression that you will begin with a big advantage, one that even a clumsy opening may not destroy. Audiences are naturally sympathetic, and if the speaker looks and acts like a gentleman, if he seems modest, honest, and earnest, they want him to win. Behave with an unobtrusive but cheerful dignity. Listen attentively to the other speakers if there are any. Sit easily erect, assuming neither a military

rigidity nor the still worse self-conscious, make-believe ease. Do not talk glibly to the chairman. Do not whisper any more than is necessary. If someone in the audience does it during your talk, you will be disturbed. Do not bow or smile to acquaintances in the audience. It is easy to give the impression of "showing off." Courtesy and tact, the active study of the audience that governs your preparation, will give you counsel here. See yourself in the audience looking up at the speaker and your bearing will be appropriate.

Presently the chairman is introducing you. Do not make faces or in any way try to signal the audience that the nice things he is saying about you are not true. The chairman, if he is competent, will be complimentary and not flattering. There is always a good reason why the speaker is present. He occupies a position which gives him special knowledge, he is an old friend, or he has a reputation for achievement in some field or other. There is no need of exaggerated praise in presenting him to the audience. In fact, flattery always embarrasses both the audience and the speaker. If the person introduced disowns it, he causes further self-consciousness and embarrassment; if he ignores it, the audience may regard him as a rather vain fellow after all. In either case, the speaker has lost the opportunity to make an effective beginning and starts with a serious handicap. The chairman, of course, should be as brief as possible. He usually concludes by turning to the speaker with some such phrase as: "I am very glad to introduce Mr. John Smith."

Beginning the Speech. You rise then and acknowledge the introduction. You may stand at your chair, bow slightly, and say "Mr. Chairman." Walk in a businesslike manner to the stand or table or to the center of the platform, well down front, and say "Ladies and gentlemen." Or you may walk immediately to the front, turn first to the chairman and then to your audience. The chairman should not sit until he has acknowledged your words with a bow. If you are addressing a political gathering or one that celebrates patriotism, the words "Fellow Citizens" are appropriate and carry a fresh significance. You may particularize by such phrases as "Members of the Chamber of Commerce"

or "Fellow Members"; but do not call off a list as debaters sometimes do with their "Mr. Chairman, worthy opponents, honorable judges, members of the society, ladies and gentlemen." You may overlook some group and in any event you are either too formal or a bit ludicrous. It is often best to begin without any salutation, especially before small and intimate groups.

If you have planned what still seems like a natural and satisfactory beginning, you had better stick to it, unless a change suggested by the chairman's remarks is especially definite and relevant. Do not begin by talking about yourself in either apology or explanation. This is another form of self-consciousness and weakness and is almost sure to make a poor impression upon your hearers.

Position. Pause a moment before you begin. Look at the audience for a few seconds while it is composing itself. A purposeful silence always gets attention. Stand comfortably erect, one foot slightly in advance of the other. Many directions may be given about position, but they are liable to be misleading if taken too literally. The feet need not necessarily be at an angle of forty-five degrees. You need not consciously rest upon the heel of the rear foot or upon the ball of the forward foot. What you need is a freedom that not only feels satisfactory to you but that also looks easy and well poised to the audience. Any position that makes it seem difficult to move at once in any direction is wrong. If you rest heavily upon the heels, you will be tempted to stay there and will soon look stiff and as if you were bolted to the floor. If you fold your arms or hold your hands behind you, you will presently look equally ungainly and will find it hard to break the lock. You cannot dispose of troublesome hands by putting them into your pockets. All these devices seem a little helpful at first, but they betray you into violating the principle of spontaneous action. When you are talking to the members of your family or explaining a play to your fellow members on the team, you are buoyant and active with your whole body. The trunk bends, the head turns, the eye flashes, the arm strikes out, and the legs move to support the action; that is, we are all of a piece. The ankle, the knee, the wrist, the elbow, the neck, the fingers, the

muscles of the face, are related. The movement in one produces action in practically all of them. There is a wonderful correlation and a rhythm that takes care of itself in our instinctive and involuntary action—the kind we engage in when we are alone or with those who cause us no self-consciousness. We seldom notice this natural grace just because it is so common and apparently inevitable. But any kind of fear, whether worry, doubt, haste, or stage fright, interferes in some measure with it, the more acute fears becoming even paralyzing in their effects. When an audience pays any attention to a speaker's action it is usually to ask, "What is the matter with him?" Alert, graceful carriage is taken for granted. We expect it just as we expect the bottle of milk at the door every morning without stopping to reflect how much resourcefulness and effort are behind it.

Recovering Conversational Ease. Your problem, then, is to keep or to recover your native ease. You are exhorted to be natural, but this advice, as was noted in Chap. 1, is not very helpful. In your excitement you scramble somehow through your work with no thought of your body. You are so absorbed in saying at least part of what you had in mind that you cannot possibly study your manner and are thankful to accomplish that much. Your anxiety has in part crippled you and you do the only thing natural for you at that time. You are natural but not satisfactory. You are in a sense learning all over again how to talk and act in company. The baby learning to walk has much of your clumsiness. He is concerned only in making the distance from the chair to your arms. After he has done it a few times he loosens the tense muscles and omits unnecessary activity, does the thing easily and gracefully in a better natural manner.

But public speaking is not so common an experience with us. It is not finally relegated to our subconscious mind to function involuntarily for our convenience or necessity. We talk to produce an effect upon others, and so deliberation, study, art, materially change our primitive conduct. Everything is referred to a second person. Even walking is at times an art. The actor's walk reveals a great deal to the audience

—joy, doubt, despair, old age, majesty, courage, poor feet. There is art in the walk of the girl who passes a group of boys.

Critic and Creator. You see we must know more definitely what we are about than is included in the blanket phrase "Be natural." The artist not only knows a thing, he is aware of it. He realizes it vividly in its details, with a purpose to do something with it. That purpose is more than to make a picture or an imitation, to hold the mirror up to nature. He wishes to show how it affects him. His work reflects something of himself, "the soul of the artist." It is personal, individual, different from the work of every other person. And as he defines his purpose, he must come to examining carefully the means of bringing it about. So he compares and judges and becomes a cool critic as well as an enthusiastic creator. This double sense is always present in the good workman. He has a method that he improves with study and experience.

The Principle of Action. It will pay you to try to find some principle of action, and this includes all gesture, to which you can refer any question that may arise. When you spoke "a piece" in school, you asked whether you should raise an arm here, point a finger there, or take a step at this place. It was all perplexing because there seemed little to guide you.

You had a vague feeling that you ought to do something to avoid looking like a stick. And at last with the help of your teacher you planned a set of gestures that would make some show of animation. You thrust out your right arm, in the middle of the third paragraph; then "on the other hand," three paragraphs below, was a good cue for a jab with the left arm; "the entire country," a little later, was a splendid place to introduce the variety of a fine two-armed sweep. A digression suggested a step forward, and another made it possible to go back or to one side. All this was faithfully rehearsed and given in due time for the approval of your parents and friends, who appreciated it and were glad to see you do so well. But neither your utterance nor your action meant much to them in the way of reality or practicality. This

really was not Johnny Jones asking for something or talking to anybody in particular.

It was not, of course, anything like the superintendent's speech. He just talked about the new building and the larger number of students, how the boys and girls might get jobs and keep them. He did not seem so well trained as the prize speakers. They never stopped for a word. Their performance was as neat as that of the Victrola. And the superintendent evidently had been too busy to think out and to practice some gestures. At any rate the audience could not recall that he made any as fine as those of the graduates, or indeed, that he made any at all. But he did give them a comfortable sense of relaxation; he told them things they wanted to hear about their children and themselves. He was not much of an orator, but he was interesting and made everybody feel that he was just the man for the schools and the town.

The New Freedom. Much more than action was involved in these impressions of exhibition and of reality. But the superintendent had much more correctly expressive action than the young folk with all their obvious gestures. That is just it. Most true action is so subtle and pervasive that we do not notice it any more than we do our breathing or the circulation of the blood. So when we become suddenly conscious that something is wrong with the speaker's body or manner or appearance, we try to adjust his arms or legs or knees or fingers. We might as well be manipulating a marionette. We are not getting at the man at all. It is not that he must learn to manipulate arms and legs for himself, but that he must learn to forget them in the way he does in private. His mind is in bondage or frozen. How can it be made free again so that nature will react upon it as usual?

Repose. It has already been said that even a slight fear arrests, cramps, or deranges those intricate coordinations and delicate responses which make up bodily behavior. The first step, then, in gesture is to depend upon the medicine of encouragement, experience, and familiarity to restore you to mental health. With the return of ease and relaxation of mind most of the angularity and stiffness of body will disappear. You will stand before the audience with springiness and buoy-

ancy, with a feeling of energy centered in the upper chest. You are lightly poised on your feet with a feeling that you wish to go forward to meet your audience. You are not conscious of your hands, which rest easily at your sides and are quick to respond to a hair-trigger suggestion. You can turn the head on the body without effort. You can walk to the right or left without stepping on your feet or acting as though they belonged to someone else. You are acquiring repose and authority.

Cultivating Action. Although this regaining of conversational ease is the most important step, there is something else about action to be considered. Conversation is casual and aimless compared with public speaking or heightened conversation. The language and the action of actors in a play are like those of conversation, but also considerably different. We have to take account of a different perspective. The wall painting is done in larger strokes; some details are omitted and others magnified to give the right focus. The public speaker elevated at some distance from his audience, and with a very definite purpose to achieve, must take the shortest route to his goal. His own emotions are more active than they would be in conversation, his audience is paying much closer attention to him and for a much longer time than it ordinarily would in conversation. In this tenser atmosphere, trick, gesture, mannerism not noticeable in conversation may become painfully distinct. So there is need for a sort of specialized action, a cultivated natural action that is both amplified and trimmed or pruned. The comparison between the greenhouse rose and the usual garden rose, or that between the Oregon apple tree and the one in a neglected New England orchard, will present itself. You must point your gesture as you do your language. Just as you will avoid clumsy phrases or repetitions or generalities in speech, you will avoid excessive repetition, extravagances, or meaningless motion of the hands, feet, or head. These obscure and distract. They blur the picture you are creating.

Gesture. As gesture is the response of individual understanding and feeling, it is difficult to teach. An instructor may say, "Do not thrust your fingers out like so many clothespins. Relax and let them turn in a bit." He can give you many a useful suggestion about details, espe-

cially negative ones, but he can no more give you a handy set of gestures than he can give you a pair of wings and bid you fly. No two of us respond in the same way to the same thought. We translate ourselves through so many means. The shrug of the shoulder, the lift of the eyebrow, the curl of the lip, the turn of the head, the uplifted chest, the clenched fist, the quirk of the voice, the glance of the eye, the face and bearing, contribute to a unity of effect so variously and subtly composed that we can only discuss cautiously a larger item, here and there, that seems to be out of harmony with the rest.

The sign language was ancient and elaborate before speech was invented and accompanies words to a far greater degree than we are ever aware of. It is fundamental, instinctive. Our speech is slowly learned and always comparatively unfamiliar to us. We still very often read a person more accurately through his action than through his words. When the two conflict we trust the former. Action, then, is both universal and individual, like speech.[1]

Individual Differences. This individuality or peculiarity is most easily distinguished in the bodily behavior of the races. An Englishman, for instance, would hardly dare to give advice on gesture to a Frenchman, and yet each may be good in his kind of speaking, and the audience will enjoy both kinds as long as it feels no violation of sincerity or freedom of action. The restraint of the Englishman and the vivid animation of the Frenchman are characteristic of differing types, and the audience adjusts itself to sympathize with a racial as well as with an individual expression. But neither speaker can imitate the other without loss of convincingness and personality.

Differences in action may be just as great, however, among individuals of the same nationality. We rejoice in the vigorous acrobatic style of Billy Sunday and the chaste and classic style of Woodrow Wilson. Each reveals himself in his own way. The manner must fit the man. Personality reflects itself in so many ways that mediocrity often imitates the mannerisms or idiosyncrasies of genius. These are, of course, violations of our sense of good taste or propriety or graceful-

[1] See C. H. Woolbert, "Fundamentals of Speech," Chaps. IV and V.

ness, and it is in spite of them, not because of them, that great speakers and actors capture us. They may add a certain attractiveness as a black patch may on the face of a beauty, but in themselves they are a blemish and instantly appear as such in the work of others. Henry Irving was a great man who chose acting as his medium. His harsh voice, lame leg, and oddities of gesture were a handicap, but his tremendous personality fascinated and dominated every audience, and action that would have looked only clumsy or amateurish in others added mystery and illusion to his portrayal. Naturally he was the most imitated man on the stage, and the imitations, even when most accurate, were grotesque or absurd. They were Hamlet without Hamlet, Irving without Irving—a striking lesson on the impossibility of transferring action or of telling another what action is appropriate in a given situation.

This does not mean that you cannot improve your own gesture. You can do that, but not by going outside yourself into the study of the classified lists of names—the hand supine, prone, or vertical; the zones, upper, middle, and lower; and the rest of the terminology that indicates some of the great variety of gesture. Nathan Sheppard in that excellent book "Before an Audience" pokes fun at the mechanical rules of the elocutionist. Referring to one, he says:

> Where did you get this rule? From conversation. Finding that we do this naturally, let us do it mechanically. We do it by instinct in private talking, let us do it by rule in public speaking. Finding that while eating, every time your elbow bends your mouth flies open, therefore this rule: When your elbow bends, open your mouth. . . .

What would Sheppard have said of this very specific direction one writer gives for discrimination in handshaking:

> Greeting.—Offer your hand as if to shake hands: (*a*) with palm up, you greet a superior; (*b*) with palm down, an inferior; (*c*) edgewise, an equal. (The head bowing.)

Frequently the supine hand expresses good humor or frankness, and the vertical hand, palm out, expresses repulsion, but a great many other

actions suggest them, too. Repulsion may be expressed without movement of the hand at all. It may be more emphatically shown by the eye, the nose, the turn of the head, the tone of the voice. It depends upon the individual, upon his "set" or tendency in action and upon the vividness, the intensity, of his thought of repulsion.

Practice Gesture. The first step in improving action is to give way to the impulse to gesture. Loosen up. Exaggerate. Study an emotional passage that interests you. Realize it fully. Then read it aloud and try to make it impressive or convincing through gesture. Memorize a short passage so that both hands will be free, and let yourself go. Tear the air with your passion, if you will, as long as it helps you to move about. Even meaningless extravagant waving of the arms and walking about will help you to a lightness, a buoyancy of position, an eager-to-go feeling that is necessary for energetic bearing and action. The baseball player swings three bats as he waits his turn to bat. As he steps to the plate, he throws two aside. How light the remaining bat now feels as he holds it ready for action. The exercise with the extra bats has developed a reserve power that is very noticeable in his business swing.

All Speaking Emotional. Remember that every talk, no matter how prosy or homely, must be given with energy and enthusiasm. All effective speaking is emotional in the sense that it is informed with a lively desire to be understood or believed. You must be interested and show your interest before you can be interesting. There is too often a strange inconsistency between the alert, vigorous deportment of the man in his office and his dull, subdued, and negative appearance on the platform. He has lost his usual positive suggestion of mastery. If he never had it, physical exercise, better health, is perhaps the thing he most needs.

Better Carriage. Everywhere it is the bearing and carriage of a person that first impress. The "chesty" man is respected. He looks confident and self-reliant. Luther H. Gulick in "The Efficient Life" says, "Not one man in ten carries himself so as to look his best." His motto for good position is: "Keep the neck pressed back against the collar." He recommends this exercise:

Inhale slowly and as strongly as possible. At the same time press the neck back firmly against the collar. Now hold it there hard. There is no harm in doing this in an exaggerated way. The object is to straighten out that part of the back which is directly between the shoulders. This deepens the chest.

Gulick sums up an interesting and practical chapter by assuring us that we can be physically fit and effective if we make these three provisions:

1. Five minutes each day of muscular exercise
2. Short intervals during the day of fresh air, brisk walking, deep breathing
3. The reservation of at least one day a week for rest and recreation

You will be greatly helped to ease and intimacy if you can find something to do before your audience. Pick up books or papers, walk to the blackboard, point out items on a chart—do anything that will require you to lift a hand or to move about to some purpose. One deliberate bit of action is often enough to throw off the spell of embarrassment.

Physical Exercise. If one is healthy, but in a lifeless, vegetable sort of way, competitive eye-to-eye exercise like tennis, boxing, or wrestling is most helpful. One must overcome his habitual inertia and lackluster eye by developing better habits through livelier and more forceful contact with others.

If the student is naturally a bit awkward, dancing and other exercises that encourage lightness, grace, or delicacy of movement are suggested. Setting-up exercises like Walter Camp's "daily dozen" are useful in establishing deep breathing, poise, and coordination.

Sometimes it is relaxation that is most needed. The muscles seem cramped and stiff. Relax them. Sit comfortably in a chair. Let your head drop forward until your chin almost touches your chest. Lift it easily and let it fall back as far as it can. You will feel only the muscles in the back of the neck. Repeat this several times with the eyes blank, half closed. Then turn the head slowly from right to left and from left to right. Revolve the head slowly first in one direction, then in the other.

Stand up easily erect. Raise the arms over the head, palms in. Bend forward slowly at the waist and let the whole upper body relax, the arms extended loosely toward the floor. Repeat this exercise five or six times.

Practice with one arm and then the other, lifting it forward over the head and dropping it completely relaxed. Raise it laterally and drop it.

Swing the leg, relaxed so that all the weight is felt in the foot, forward and back, and right and left across the other.

Rest heavily on your heels. Raise the balls of the feet and twist to the right and left. Stand on the toes, raise the heels, and turn. Rock back and forth from toe to heel and back again.

Shake the hand and fingers so that they seem to dangle very loosely from the wrist. Loosen the fingers by opening and closing the hand twenty times.

Standing stock still throughout the speech is a tiresome fault. Imagine yourself standing before an audience. Take a step or two forward. Step back. Walk to the right. Turn and come back. Go to the left. Notice that you do not awkwardly cross one leg over the other in turning, but that you turn first on the balls of the feet. You are facing the right or the left before you step out with the free foot. This is all very simple, but you may need to practice it deliberately before you see how to correct your platform carriage.

"Shadow" Practice. Stand before a long mirror and gesticulate. Remember you are purposely exaggerating to break up the icy self-consciousness that prevents the flow of normal expression. You will see at once that a sagging at the hips or the knees does not carry conviction and that legs too far apart suggest a vulgar or impudent ease. Straighten up, then, with chest up and feet close together and pointing out, one slightly in advance of the other. Look at the whole of the audience. It is exasperating to have a speaker look fixedly in one spot all the time. You should not of course keep moving your head from side to side, but you should occasionally turn your head to the right or the left. Give

the impression of including everybody in your remarks. If shadow boxing is good for the pugilist, shadow platform practice ought to help the speaker. Do not be afraid of being ridiculous. You are engaged in a serious attempt to free your impulse to action, and your room is sometimes a better laboratory for experiment than is a hall full of spectators.

Eliminating False Motion. Acquiring the habit of supple activity, of desiring and daring to move hands and feet, is only the first step. Just as you test and select words on the principle of economy, choosing those that tell the most, that express most clearly and vividly and concisely what you wish to say, so you economize in action. You begin to eliminate false or meaningless motion. You can see yourself in the audience looking up and judging yourself on the platform. You see that even a graceful or forceful gesture becomes ineffective if it is repeated too often. Every gesture must have sufficient ease and strength to look right to the audience and to carry a definite meaning. Avoid those little nervous thrusts to the right or left that are made by a twist of the wrist or a movement of the elbow. They are too niggardly and incomplete to suggest anything but timidity. Begin the movement from the shoulder and use the whole arm even though the gesture extends only a few inches forward or to the side. Practice this rounder, fuller and in every way more convincing free-arm gesture. No gesture at all is better than jabs from the wrist or the elbow.

If you move about, do it with a definite purpose. Step or walk firmly, decisively. Study good actors in this respect. The fidgety person who moves doubtfully and gingerly is considered a rank amateur. Learn to stand still. You will not look wooden when you are in easy control any more than you will seem to be hesitating or blundering when you make a deliberate pause. You are, in fact, showing signs of poise, power, and emphasis.

Action Always Present. Gesture is a difficult subject to discuss without illustration, but fortunately the experience of a lifetime has trained the eye to distinguish the weak or extravagant gesture from the restrained but ample gesture. The movement strikes us as adequate or

inadequate, false or true. You need to examine deliberately the reasons for your satisfaction or dissatisfaction. So study all the speakers you can. They will make you realize that you cannot avoid action, that you are always doing something on the platform, and that it corroborates, supplements or contradicts the meaning of your words. You will see that some men are effective with gestures, others without them; that some men move about considerably and that others seem to move hardly at all. You will sense the harmony in a speaker, but will be so absorbed in his message that you are scarcely aware of the means. This is almost a perfect union of speech and action. You will learn that a useful or true gesture is not obtrusive, even when it is striking. It is not exhibitional but necessary to the speaker to complete his meaning, to illuminate it or sharpen it. Another speaker might complete the same phrase with a different physical response and be equally understood. But whatever their peculiarities good speakers are thoroughly alive in the trunk, the head, the face, and the eyes. Do not imitate anybody, but apply the lessons of the failure or success of others.

Empathy. The thing to remember about all this is that like begets like. If you are slouchy in bearing, your audience slumps too. If you are stiff and tense, your listeners have disagreeable muscle tensions. If you are composed, yet alert, relaxed yet alive, your audience enjoys agreeable muscular reactions. The psychologists call this principle of unconscious imitation "empathy," and urge us to be aware of empathic stimuli. Gesture, gait, position, movement in general, may be tested by this somewhat fascinating idea. An audience gets tired in following a meaningless, monotonous amble from one end of the platform to the other, it wearies of an uncomfortable posture, it is refreshed by the stretch of a natural, but not too frequent, gesture. It takes pleasure in a rhythm that is familiar and varied. These physical communications are often too subtle for easy analysis, but their total effect is noticeable enough. The speaker without vitality is deadening. The feverish faker of enthusiasm is strained, and wearing on those about him. But a genuine zest is also contagious. Its inspiriting effect, especially if it comes with a fresh breath after a dull talk, is truly remarkable. The languishing audi-

ence recovers like withered flowers after rain. Bodily tone is highly suggestible. The audience sees it, feels it, and sits up with a delighted thrill. This physical well-being has its own eloquence.

The speaker may not always have this robust energy to radiate its priceless empathy, but other qualities have their compensating empathic virtues. Actors, no matter how sick, will insist that "the show must go on." Their loyalty surmounts pain, weakness, and fever. Their courage, boldness, and resolute imitation of the right bearing and attitudes create the favorable empathy, so that the audience rarely gets the unfavorable suggestion of low body tone. The public speaker, on occasion, faces a similar task. Despite worry, grief, or poor health, he must appear and carry on. No one will accuse him of insincerity if he tries to hide these. He is simply loyal to his responsibility of interesting and entertaining. He must, then, learn to dramatize his best self and play the part as he knows it should be played.

We sometimes wonder why stiff and awkward bearing on the platform not only distracts and embarrasses an audience, but also makes it laugh. Bergson, in "Laughter," says that when man takes on the clumsiness, the rigidity, of a thing he may become, unconsciously, funny. This paragraph is deeply significant.

> In a public speaker, for instance, we find that gesture vies with speech. Jealous of the latter, gesture closely dogs the speaker's thought, demanding also to act as interpreter. Well and good; but then it must pledge itself to follow thought through all the phases of its development. An idea is something that grows, buds, blossoms, and ripens from the beginning to the end of a speech. It never halts, never repeats itself. It must be changing every moment, for to cease to change would be to cease to live. Then let gesture display a like animation! Let it accept the fundamental law of life, which is the complete negation of repetition! But I find that a certain movement of head or arm, a movement always the same, seems to return at regular intervals. If I notice it and it succeeds in diverting my attention, if I wait for it to occur and it occurs when I expect it, then involuntarily I laugh. Why? Because I have before me a machine that works automatically. This is no longer life, it is automatism established in life and imitating it. It belongs to the comic.

Speak Up. You are still waiting to begin your speech. Speak your first words slowly and distinctly but not too loud. Cultivate an easy but firm attack. Talk to the back of the room. Study those in the last seats. Do they look as though they hear you easily, or is strain or resignation reflected in their attitudes? Voice training will be discussed in another chapter, but remember now to make yourself heard. All your preparation has gone for naught if at the last your audience cannot hear you. As you proceed, then, lift the voice gradually. Try to keep a conversational tone, but make it buoyant and resonant. Keep it up and forward at the lips. Do not growl or grumble or mutter in the throat. The young actor acquires authority by talking up. He adjusts his tone to the audience, not to the stage. The older generation of actors have, as a rule, a much more satisfactory enunciation than the younger, who, in their passion for realism, for natural and intimate touches, lapse too far into the casual and the actual tone of conversation. This produces not the illusion they wish to create, but only obscurity and impatience. Art always adds something to nature. The elocution of the "palmy days," though now much derided because it was so often artificial, bombastic or "stagey," did teach careful and often distinguished utterance, as well as graceful and manly bearing. The public speaker cannot afford to slump even in privacy, because correct, well-spoken English and good bearing must become habitual. The actor only plays a part and with words that are not his own, words that can be carefully studied and memorized. He can step out of the part at will. But the speaker is undone if he gives the faintest suggestion of playing a part, of being not sincere or not earnest. He must always be his own best self.

Study Your Voice. Listen to your own voice. Does it sound weak or listless, squeaky or throaty? Are you talking too fast or too slow? In extemporaneous speaking, no matter how well prepared the subject may be, the speaker is often a little slow. He feels about cautiously for the idea or for the language to clothe it. Experience overcomes this to a great extent. The speaker acquires a larger working vocabulary, and if he confines himself to a few subjects he will soon have a ready stock of

phrases and patterns of speech. Unnecessary repetition, explanation, or elaboration are almost as bad as hesitation. The audience is bored and seems to say, "Yes, yes, go on."

Rapid speech, on the other hand, is liable to be indistinct, shrill, and monotonous. Before a small audience, where the pitch of the voice may be lower, this danger is not so great. In speaking before a large audience, especially in the open, a slow, prolonged utterance, almost a chant, is necessary for clearness.

Need of Variety. The important thing is variety of tempo. The deliberate speaker and the tempestuous one may be equally effective if pause and change in the rate of speed characterize the delivery. They break up the too smoothly flowing rhythm that puts the audience to sleep. Even the poets who work in conventional and mechanical measures have subtle variations in their lines. Too great a uniformity is deadly to emphasis or even attention.

Pause. A pause is more than an aid to variety. It is an "eloquent silence." It sums up what has just been said and challenges reflection, or it piques the curiosity for what is to come. It is dramatic and suggests more than many words. It is the actor's pet device in focusing or crystallizing interest. Young speakers are usually too nervous to make a cool, sustained pause. They race or dawdle to the end. If they stop it is only to catch the breath or to struggle frantically for a word or an idea. This consciousness of weakness causes them to think that the audience will misinterpret a genuine pause, mistake it for uncertainty, involuntary hesitation.

Force. The force, or intensity, of utterance is subject to the same law of variety. Mere loudness will not hold the attention long. The booming of Niagara arouses the wonder of the visitor, but those who live near it seldom notice it. Those who live along the lines of the elevated railroads soon get used to the roar of the cars and are lulled to sleep by it. They would probably wake up with a start, however, if the din suddenly ceased. The change would capture their attention.

Do Not Hammer. Young speakers need to let go rather than to

check their exuberancy, but we very often see and hear an overemphasis that becomes wearying. Teachers, lawyers, and others who "lay down the law" fall into habits of pounding and hammering out their words in a rhythmic and monotonous utterance. They sound ill-tempered or querulous. We wish they did not take themselves quite so seriously. Or they remind us of the pianist with the unvarying blacksmith touch. The sledge hammer is fine—nothing like it in its place and at the right moment—but it will not do for the touch that should be as light as gossamer. Do not stress every other word. It is a sign of lazy, hazy thinking. Cultivate your ear. Listen to yourself and you will soon get the habit of detecting and correcting any three-cylinder sounds of distress and waste. Lightness of touch, ease, and discrimination must accompany the heaviest blows.

Inflection. Interest is best sustained through good inflection. Transition from one paragraph to another, from topic to topic, is best shown by a change in pitch. Go from a lower level or key to an upper one and back again. This variety is supplemented by the modulation or inflection or prominence that is given syllables, words, and phrases. Many attempts have been made to classify the almost innumerable accents and changes of which the voice is capable. They are of little practical value except to remind us that expression which is both earnest and free speaks in a rich melody, not in a monotone. Inflection is an indication of active thought. The clergyman who drones through his sermon in the ministerial tone may be earnest and sincere, but his mind is comparatively asleep. He is dealing in words, not ideas. He is not alive to the complete meaning of the words because his mind is not concentrated upon it. The boy just learning to read, who speaks slowly and dubiously one word at a time: "Oh-see-the-dog-chase-the-cat," is in much the same case. He is too intent upon discovering words to translate them properly. But hear him speak the same words in excited glee to his playmate. The involuntary inflection has a world of suggestion and eloquence. No one needs to be taught to express with vivid modulation what he really knows and feels. But he seldom really knows it and feels it. He has only a vague surface notion. He needs to see almost

every idea that is capital for the speaker more clearly—in its details, its cause and effect, its relation to other ideas.

Reading Aloud. The conversation of able and animated minds gives us the key to inflection. Inflection is as natural and instinctive a language as is the sign language. Even animals understand it. But as in the case of gesture you will find it worth the trouble to study inflection consciously and deliberately. Just as gesture must not only be right but must look right to the audience, so inflection must fall upon the ear of the listener with true emphasis that is neither subdued nor exaggerated. The platform tends to paralyze inflection just as it does action. The remedy must be one which will aid in restoring activity of mind—ease and freedom. So practice on florid, dramatic, or melodramatic selections for bold attack and a wide range of obvious inflection. Let the voice ring out in command or praise or joy. Pull the stops for wrath, sorrow, dignity, and hate. Practice next the delicate nuances of a lyric or a sonnet; read aloud some of Huxley's practical and interesting talk on evolution. Try everything for flexibility and daring. But be sure, first of all, that you know what you are talking about. If a single word is doubtful to you, look it up in the dictionary and study it again in the light of the context. Reading another's work is somewhat like translating a foreign language. The words and the ideas behind them are often so foreign to our own that we must give them considerable study before they arouse the desired reaction in us, before we test the author's message in the light of our own experience. The college student often reads aloud no better than the grammar-school boy. He fails to understand fully and to interpret sympathetically the language of the author. If he understood fully he would inflect properly. But it is because he is satisfied with the surface thought that his reading lacks almost all of the subtle and many of the obvious modulations that a genuinely interested reader would have. The thought has not been assimilated. It is still foreign. A reporter thus described the "spirit" talk from the mouth of a "medium":

> Words were well chosen and phraseology was good. Indeed the message sounded as if it were being read from a dull book; so exact was it and so far

from conversational structure. The stuff in substance and quality resembled the "strenuous life" material Theodore Roosevelt used to give to interviewers when he kindly assisted them to fill space without committing himself to definite policies; a masterly collection of abstracts which gave the ear the impression of being concretes, until the post-interview and disenglamoured intellect analyzed them. Sometimes, without Roosevelt's accompanying action, his gestures, his oratory, his hand-clappings, his knee slappings, his frownings, his facial expressions, his teeth-revealing smiles and grins, the matter of his discourses would have been dull and tedious and prosy.

The Persuasiveness of Voice and Action. All language is comparatively vague and cold until it is informed and colored by the alert thinking of the speaker and the audience. Sheridan had this in mind when he declined an offer of a thousand pounds for permission to publish his famous speech against Warren Hastings. The members of Parliament and the great audiences at the trial were so stirred with indignation and rage against the viceroy, and so moved with pity for his alleged victims, that the expected vote was put off for fear an injustice might be done Hastings. Fox, Burke, Pitt, and other great orators said it was the greatest speech they had ever heard and thought it was very possibly the most effective ever delivered. And the speech has never been printed. Fragments inaccurately recalled by some of those present, and a great deal of comment, are all we possess of it today.

Perhaps it is just as well. Very few of the great speeches that have been preserved give more than a hint of their original appeal, and most of them are disappointing. But how can they be anything else? The exciting occasions that gave them birth, the speakers that fired them with their courage and ardor, and the audiences that felt their very lives or manhood at stake are missing. All we have are the cold ashes of these flaming appeals. Sheridan had a wise detachment that convinced him that his speech on paper would look like an indifferent thing after all and would create eternal astonishment that it could have made such a fuss in the world. The eloquence was not in the words, but in the speaker, his splendid presence and thrilling tones; it was in the magnificent setting, the great hall made doubly impressive by the majesty

of royalty, the dignity of Court and Commons, the wealth of genius and fame, and the spectacle of the huge crowd intent upon the gorgeous pageantry and the powerful drama almost too fascinating to be real. It is no wonder that Sheridan preferred the myth that posterity might make about it all to the dull and misleading record of mere words.

Your plain businesslike talk is drama, too. Suggest good health, good humor, enjoyment of the situation before you, knowledge of your subject, and pleasure and skill in showing its possibilities for your listeners, and you become somebody, a personality. You weave your design with energy and emotion—an enthusiasm for facts, causes, and effects, and a lively desire to make them clear to others—and that is drama.

Concluding. You will conclude appropriately and vigorously, according to schedule, if you have made an outline for your talk. Plan a definite argument, exhortation, congratulation, or review, and you will not wobble as speakers often do. Hold up the last sentence and the last word firmly. Do not act as if you had already finished and the last words were of no consequence.

And do not say "Thank you" or "I thank you." The phrase has been terribly overworked as a conventional ending, especially by pompous politicians. The audience will take your thanks for granted and will appreciate your poise in refraining from the use of this stale expression, which is too often merely a cover for a weak exit.

After your last word, pause a moment or bow slightly as you might in leaving a companion. If your chair is some distance away turn and walk easily to it. Do not step back and try to find it with your heels.

OUTLINE FOR A CRITICISM OF A TALK

I. Subject

Was the subject one of general interest or was it for a special group?
Was the aim to make clear, to impress, to induce action, or to entertain?
Was the subject sufficiently restricted? Was it within the speaker's powers?
Was the subject commonplace, unusual, trite, or was it made successful by novel illustrations or applications?

II. Preparation

Was there evidence of a studied plan? Did the introduction win immediate attention?

Were all the details relevant to the main theme? (Unity)

Was the subject developed clearly and logically? (Coherence)

Was the chief thought made vivid and penetrating by a striking introduction, by ample statement, by particulars, by comparison or contrast, or by a forceful summary? (Emphasis)

Were reflection, observation, critical judgment, as well as book knowledge, apparent?

III. Presentation

Did the speaker give an impression of confidence, reserve power? Did he look directly at the audience? At the whole of it or only a part?

Was there sufficient response to the thought by head, body, hands, and feet?

Was the speaker "a galvanic human battery on two legs"?

Was the style conversational, oratorical, or dramatic?

Was the talk memorized in whole or in part?

Was the speaker talking to himself or to his audience?

IV. Diction

Was the language pointed or dull, specific or general?

Was it alive with suggestion?

Were the grammar, pronunciation, enunciation, satisfactory?

Were there any awkward expressions or needless repetitions? Too many "ands," "uhs," "whys," or "wells"?

Was the vocabulary meager, ample, or rich?

Did you note any exceptionally interesting words or unusual applications of familiar ones?

V. Voice

Was the tone thin? raucous? nasal? shrill? high? low? rasping? full? guttural? resonant? commanding? sympathetic?

Was the voice monotonous? lifeless?

Was the inflection richly varied? the pitch sufficiently changed?

Was the utterance deliberate, or rapid, or both?

Was pause skillfully employed?

Were syllables clipped?

Were vowels sufficiently prolonged?

Was force gained by intensity of speech? by loudness? by contrasting soft tones? by discriminating accentuation of words and phrases?

VI. Personality

Was the speaker's physique impressive? Was he able to overcome its handicap or support its advantage by skillful speech and bearing?

Did he make any reference to the special nature of the audience or the occasion?

Did he display too little energy or too much, or had he the right proportions of energy and poise?

Was the speaker sincere or pretentious? natural or artificial? dignified or trivial?

Did he show any signs of vanity or mock modesty?

Was his manner cheerful, heavy, aloof, intimate, formal, negative, or positive?

Was his talk chiefly narration, explanation, or argument? Can you recall his best incidents or stories?

Was he wordy or concise? Did he seem to have a liberal education and special training?

Did you feel that he had something to say or that he had to say something?

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Give a short talk in which you discuss both the thought and the presentation of a public speaker Use the outline given above, but do not try to answer all the questions They are intended to be only suggestive hints for analysis Uniform adherence to them by every student is liable to make the reports impersonal and stereotyped Your review should be as interesting and personal as any other talk Try the exercise on several types, such as, a forum speaker, a public man, a businessman, a clergyman

II. Be prepared to read before the class with understanding and energy one or more of the following selections

1. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that never since God made Demosthenes has He made a man better fitted for a great work than Daniel O'Connell

You may say that I am partial to my hero, but John Randolph of Roanoke, who hated an Irishman almost as much as he did a Yankee, when he got to London and heard O'Connell, the old slaveholder threw up his hands and exclaimed, This is the man, those are the lips, the most eloquent that speak English in my day," and I think he was right

Webster could address a bench of judges, Everett could charm a college, Choate could delude a jury, Clay could magnetize a Senate, and Tom Corwin could hold the mob in his right hand, but no one of these men could do more than this one thing The wonder about O'Connell was that he could outtalk Corwin, he could charm a college better than Everett, and leave Henry Clay himself far behind in magnetizing a Senate

It has been my privilege to have heard all the great orators of America who have become singularly famed about the world's circumference I know what was the majesty of Webster, I know what it was to melt under the magnetism of Henry Clay, I have seen eloquence in the iron logic of Calhoun, but O'Connell was Webster, Clay and Calhoun in one Before the courts, logic, at the bar of the Senate, unanswerable and dignified, on the platform, grace, wit and pathos, before the masses, a whole man Emerson says, "There is no true eloquence, unless there is a man behind the speech" Daniel O'Connell was listened to because all England and Ireland knew that there was a man behind the speech—one who could be neither bought, bullied nor cheated

And then, besides his irreproachable character he had what is half the power of a popular orator, he had a majestic presence A little O'Connell would have been no O'Connell at all In youth he had the brow of a Jupiter and the stature of Apollo Sydney Smith says of Lord John Russell s five feet, when he went down to Yorkshire after the Reform bill had passed, the stalwart hunters of Yorkshire exclaimed,

"What! that little shrimp, he carry the Reform bill!" "No, no!" said Smith, "he was a large man, but the labors of the bill shrunk him."

I remember the story Russell Lowell tells of Webster, when, a year or two before his death, the Whig party thought of dissolution, Webster came home from Washington and went down to Faneuil Hall to protest, and four thousand of his fellow Whigs came out Drawing himself up to his loftiest proportions, his brow charged with thunder, before the listening thousands, he said, "Gentlemen, I am a Whig, a Massachusetts Whig, a Faneuil Hall Whig, a revolutionary Whig, a constitutional Whig If you break up the Whig party, sir, where am I to go?" And says Lowell, "We all held our breath, thinking where he could go But if he had been five feet three we should have said, 'Who do you suppose cares where you go?' "

Well, O'Connell had all that, and true nature seemed to be speaking all over him It would have been a pleasure even to look at him if he had not spoken at all, and all you thought of was a greyhound

And then he had what so few American speakers have, a voice that sounded the gamut I heard him once in Exeter Hall say, "Americans, I send my voice careering across the Atlantic like a thunder storm, to tell the slaveholders of the Carolinas that God's thunderbolts are hot, and to remind the negro that the dawn of his redemption is drawing near," and I seemed to hear his voice reverberating and re-echoing back to London from the Rocky Mountains

And then, with the slightest possible flavor of an Irish brogue, he would tell a story that would make all Exeter Hall laugh, and the next moment there would be tears in his voice, like an old song, and five thousand men would be in tears. And all the while no effort—he seemed only breathing

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

2 If you ever saw a crow with a king bird after him, you will get an image of a dull speaker and a lively listener The bird in sable plumage flaps heavily along his straightforward course, while the other sails around him, over him, under him, leaves him, comes back again, tweaks out a black feather, shoots away once more, never losing sight of him and finally reaches the crow's perch at the same time the crow does, having cut a perfect labyrinth of loops and knots and spirals while the slow fowl was painfully working from one end of his straight line to the other.

OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table."

3. When public bodies are to be addressed on momentous occasions, when great interests are at stake and strong passions excited, nothing is valuable in speech further than it is connected with high intellectual and moral endowments. Clear-

ness, force and earnestness are the qualities that produce conviction. True eloquence, indeed, does not consist in speech. It cannot be brought from far. Labor and learning may toil for it, but they will toil in vain. Words and phrases may be marshalled in every way, but they cannot compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject and in the occasion.

Affected passion, intense expression, the pomp of declamation, all may aspire to it; they cannot reach it. It comes, if it come at all, like the outbreaking of a fountain from the earth, or the bursting forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, native, original force. The graces taught in the schools, the costly ornaments and studied contrivances of speech, shock and disgust men when their own lives, and the fate of their wives, their children, hang on the decision of the hour. Then words have lost their power, rhetoric is vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible. Even genius itself then feels rebuked and subdued, as in the presence of higher qualities.

Then patriotism is eloquent; then self-devotion is eloquent. The clear conception, outrunning deductions of logic, the high purpose, the firm resolve, the dauntless spirit, speaking on the tongue, beaming from the eye, informing every feature and urging the whole man onward,—this, this is eloquence; or rather it is something greater and higher than all eloquence,—it is action, noble, sublime, god-like action.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

4. "What art thou afraid of? Wherefore, like a coward, dost thou forever pip and whimper, and go cowering and trembling? Despicable biped! What is the sum total of the worst that lies before thee? Death? Well, Death, and say the pangs of Tophet too, and all that the Devil and Man may, will, or can do against thee! Hast thou not a heart; canst thou not suffer whatso it be; and, as a Child of Freedom, though outcast, trample Tophet itself under thy feet, while it consumes thee? Let it come, then; I will meet it and defy it!" And as I so thought, there rushed like a stream of fire over my whole soul; and I shook base Fear away from me forever. I was strong, of unknown strength; a spirit, almost a god. Ever from that time, the temper of my misery was changed; not Fear or whining Sorrow was it, but Indignation and grim fire-eyed Defiance.

THOMAS CARLYLE, "Sartor Resartus."

III. *Gesture.* Memorize one or more of the following passages and rehearse them with plenty of action. Do not be afraid to exaggerate. The purpose is to free the mind and body from the various inhibitions that cramp bearing and gesture.

Recite before the class with an easy, buoyant energy. Let the face, head, shoulders, chest, and arms keep vigorous pace with the voice in revealing the complete and exact meaning of the words.

1. Here I plant my foot—here I fling defiance right into his teeth, before the American people. Here I throw the gauntlet to him and the bravest of his compeers, to come forward and defend these miserable dirty lines.

JOHN RANDOLPH.

2. We are two travelers, Roger and I;
   Roger's my dog. Come hither, you scamp!
Jump for the gentleman—mind your eye!—
   Over the table—look out for the lamp!—
The rogue is growing a little old.

JOHN TOWNSEND TROWBRIDGE.

3. Such protestations, such indignation, such sorrow, I have never seen before from so small a cause. "It cannot be thought of! It is mere ruin!" I am, in turn, as firm, and nearly as excited in seeming. I hold up the fruit, and tender the money.

"No, never, never! The Signor cannot be in earnest!"

Looking round me for a moment, and assuming a theatrical manner befitting the gestures of those about me, I fling the fruit down, and with a sublime renunciation stalk away.

CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER.

4. When everything was shipshape, I'd hand over the crown—this crown I'm wearing now—to Queen Victoria on my knees, and she'd say: "Rise up, Sir Daniel Dravot." Oh, it's big! It's big, I tell you! But there's so much to be done in every place—Bashkai, Khawak, Shu, and everywhere else.

RUDYARD KIPLING.

5. Have you no loyalty, no spring, no natural affections? Are you clock-work, hey? Away! This is no place for you. . . . Go away! Leave me!

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON.

6. Your hand, sir, and good-bye: no lights, no lights!
The street's hushed, and I know my own way back,
Don't fear me! There's the gray beginning. Zooks!

ROBERT BROWNING.

7. Go, get thee from me, Cromwell;
I am a poor fall'n man, unworthy now
To be thy lord and master; seek the king.

SHAKESPEARE, "Henry VIII."

8. You all do know this mantle; I remember
The first time ever Caesar put it on;

'Twas on a summer's evening, in his tent;
That day he overcame the Nervii;—
Look! In this place ran Cassius' dagger through:
See what a rent the envious Casca made,
Through this, the well beloved Brutus stabb'd;
And, as he plucked his cursed steel away,
Mark how the blood of Caesar followed it.

SHAKESPEARE, "Julius Caesar."

9. We have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated outselves before the throne and have implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical hands of the Ministry and Parliament.

PATRICK HENRY.

10. Yet out of this mixed, and, as you say, despicable mass, he forged a thunderbolt, and hurled it, at what?

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

IV. Speak on one of the following subjects:

1. Speeding up Production
2. The Progress of the Chain Store
3. The Malthusian Theory and Its Effect upon Business
4. The True Measure of Success
5. Public Speaking and the Businessman
6. The Workingman's Point of View
7. Women as Business Executives
8. Power Facilities in 1975
9. Justification of the Middleman
10. Competition versus Communism
11. The "Set Demonstration"
12. The Rise of Finance Companies
13. The Babbitts of Business
14. Advertising in the Magazines
15. The Efficiency Craze
16. Why Is Industry Going South?
17. College Training for Hotel Executives
18. A Survey of the Interstate Commerce Commission
19. How Do You Figure Your Profit?
20. Rayon and Its Effect on the Wool and Cotton Industries
21. The Functions of the Executive
22. The Federal Trade Commission and Trade Associations

23. The Job of Landing a Job
24. What Things Make a Good Letter Good?
25. What Makes the Tired Businessman Tired?
26. The International Bank and Fund
27. The Federal Reserve System
28. Imperial Valley
29. Atomic Warfare
30. Control of the Air

V. Eric Johnston's speech is appropriately placed here because it looks and sounds like an extemporaneous talk. Indeed, Mr. Johnston is one of the best extemporaneous speakers in the country. He has the courage of his convictions and the courage to get up before any assembly and speak without notes or paper of any kind. He is always prepared because like every good salesman he knows what he is going to say and enjoys saying it.

Practice has given him an easy, confident bearing and an effortless, winging voice. Conference has given him good sense, practicality, directness, and clarity with problems and proposed solutions. A certain jauntiness and humor may have been his "own idea."

Compare Mr. Johnston's speech with others in this book to study the degree of communicativeness. Do any of them sound like essays—literary, impersonal, comparatively remote? Are some partly oral in style and partly written? Speeches can be written and then read to sound like talk, but, as is pointed out in the next chapter, this requires more skill than most speakers have.

PARTNERS FOR PEACE [1]

By Eric A. Johnston, President, Motion Picture Association of America, delivered at a dinner of the Washington Chapter, American Institute of Banking, Washington, D.C., Feb. 21, 1948

I don't know any subject that's been more chewed over than the Marshall plan —unless it's the new look in the distaff circle. That was a case of lowering the hemline. Today, I'm going to ask you to raise your sights on the Marshall plan.

We need to take a new look at it. I've a thought or two about it which especially concerns us bankers.

I am going to speak very frankly to you because I consider myself as one of you. I am a director of banks—both on the Pacific coast and here in the east—so I think I have a right to speak bluntly and frankly without the risk of being considered anti-banker or subversive.

[1] Reprinted by permission from "Vital Speeches of the Day."

First of all, I want to make it transparently clear for the record that I'm for the Marshall plan. I don't mean I'm for every detail of the plan as it was sent up Pennsylvania Avenue to Capitol Hill, but I do mean that I heartily endorse its broad purposes.

Broadly, we look upon the Marshall plan as a proposition of our government helping other governments in 16 western European nations. Government-to-government aid is effective in a limited number of fields as nothing else can be. For instance—in the reconstruction and relocation of highways; in the rebuilding of power plants, water systems and ports. Those are all proper governmental functions.

But that's by no means the final answer to a healthy European recovery. We all want the Marshall plan to be a springboard for Europe instead of a wheel chair. We don't want it to begin as a hand-out and run on from year to year as a dole.

That's what may happen unless we in private business in this country put some kindling wood in the hearth of private business over there.

Manifestly, we've got to recognize that some of the major industries in Europe have been socialized. We can't do anything about that. But there are thousands and thousands of small and medium-sized businesses unsocialized. They need us, and we need them. The more private businessmen there are in Europe, the more private businessmen there are apt to be here.

So we can't base our aid to Europe on ideology. We will find ourselves working with assorted brands of socialism, but we might as well face up to this fact: we've got to help Europe whether she is socialist or capitalist. I maintain that as we aid in the revival of unsocialized enterprises, there will be more and more of them rebuilt, reborn or come into being.

My considered opinion is just this: Europe will stride forward again without a crutch only as private business in Europe revives. What is needed in Europe is to unleash the creative and imaginative talents of countless of thousands of entrepreneurs of the day and of tomorrow.

And that's where we come in, because it is primarily a banking job.

It's a job of money and credits and imagination and initiative. Aid from government to government, as I see it, is necessary, but it's emergency pulmotor and transfusion stuff. I'm suggesting a job for us in the banking business as something on the level of a high velocity vitamin diet over a long period—for a brisk convalescence and a permanent recovery.

So I ask this question: why don't the banks of America start lending money to sound business enterprises abroad?

I maintain it can be done.

It can be done in many instances in conjunction with banks abroad which know the character, reputation and ability of the borrower.

I want to propose tonight a program by which the American banking profession can play a vastly vital part in European recovery.

I propose we take a new look at the Marshall plan in terms of injecting a maximum amount of private enterprise aid from America into the whole picture of helping Europe recover.

There's a proviso in the Marshall plan before the Congress which needs a long, new look.

In substance, it provides that the United States government—within certain limitations—will facilitate American production loans to private European enterprises.

The idea is not revolutionary. It means simply using government machinery to facilitate private production loans as we did before in the days of war. There is good precedent for this kind of productive and profitable help to private business. And I lean on that word profitable deliberately, because of course American investors must make a profit. Some people shy from the word profit like a colt from a fire engine, as if profits were shameful. I don't. Private enterprise must have profits as the human system must have food.

Look—during the war, we had a War Production Board. It passed on the worth of projects for war production by private businesses and then loans were made, either directly by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or by private banks with RFC guarantee up to 90 per cent. The loss to the government was an amazingly small percentage—a fractional item.

So—I'll give my proposal a name. I'll call it a Peace Production Board.

I propose the inclusion of a Peace Production Board within the framework of the Marshall plan. It would pass on the worth of projects for American investors acting in cooperation with European investors and entrepreneurs.

As I envision it, the lending bank in America would take 5 per cent of any loss. The borrowing bank or the intermediary bank abroad would take the other 5 per cent of loss in those cases where loss occurred. Our government would guarantee 90 per cent of the loan.

I venture to say that we would find that the total loss would be little, if any, greater than that under loans made for war production.

Thousands of private enterprises in Europe, as I see it, are like healthy men who have been tied up hand and foot. What they need is a sharp knife in the hands of a friend. The friend is us, and the knife is our capital.

Let me give you an illustration:

Recently, there were available 10,000 tons of ingots in Austria. The Fiat Motor Company of Italy wanted them to roll into sheets. A deal could have been made to finance those 10,000 tons of ingots, ship them to the Fiat Motor Company and have them rolled into sheets.

The Italians would have kept half the steel for their own productive purposes. The remaining 5,000 tons would have been made into pipe with a ready market in the Arabian oil fields and a contract waiting from an American oil concern which wanted a pipe line.

But there was no money available to finance this deal.

As a result, there are fewer jobs in the Fiat Company than there might have been, because the ingots are not there to roll. There are fewer jobs in Italy because new Fiat jobs would have stimulated others. And the American oil company doesn't have the pipe.

We missed an opportunity not only to provide steel for American pipe lines, but we missed an opportunity to increase production where production is needed above everything else.

And if we want to think of the ideological concept of our action—or lack of action—we missed an opportunity to give gainful employment and to put a new gag in the mouths of the clamoring communists.

Could government to government do a job like this? Of course it couldn't. Governments are too tangled in red tape, tied in knots by bureaucrats, even to see opportunities like this. We've been running to government ever since the drab days of the deep depression And the more we run to government, the more we help to forge the tools of socialism. The more we as individuals can do, the more we will encourage and re develop fresh initiative and private enterprise abroad.

Don't you see that a dozen Marshall plans without the aid of private businessmen will never solve the real problem?

Don't you see that the only way to get free enterprise in Europe is to kindle it anew from over here? That's a job for the flint of American know-how and the steel of American determination.

Happily, not every opportunity such as I have described has gone by the boards. Some have been snapped up. They encourage me to look to the future I know of a case where American dollars are buying pulp in Sweden, which is shipped to France, converted to rayon and the rayon sold abroad—to everybody's satisfaction. That is enterprise. That, gentlemen, is git-up-and git.

Multiply it ten thousand times over, and what have we?

I say we've got a real European recovery program based on self-help; we've got a real promise of a peaceful, stable world, and we've got a new string to the bow of the American economy.

We bankers wring our hands in futile inaction because we say currencies are unstable, and how can we carry on trade without a stable exchange? I say that if we must wait for that before stimulating the flow of merchandise, then we must admit we are all through.

After all, trade was invented before anybody heard the word money.

What is exchange? It is simply an easy medium for the payment of goods. It is a convenience acquired through years of understanding and effort. But any commodity is good whether it is exchanged or not. That commodity can be exchanged for a commodity some place else if there are people around with the ingenuity to turn the trick.

I call this idea of hooking up American capital and American know-how with European capital and European manpower—partnership capitalism. And it's in partnership capitalism I place my greatest hope for world reconstruction and for lifting the living standards of people throughout the world. Partnership capitalism in the form of productive loans is a far cry from old-time capitalistic adventuring abroad. That kind sought to exploit peoples and countries. It was killed off because it was an affront to natural laws and human rights.

Partnership capitalism is just the opposite, and that's why it will work.

It recognizes natural laws and human rights.

I see a chance for vital expansion of partnership capitalism through a Peace Production Board. It is my opinion that through the plan we can create a climate for a steady growth of partnership capitalism. I think it is a chance for all of us in industry to be veritable paladins of American democracy and American free enterprise, exerting a leadership based on mutuality and reciprocity.

This we know for a certainty: if we want partners in peace, we must build partners in prosperity.

It will be just so much talk without action, so I summarize my proposal:

1. A Peace Production Board within the framework of the Marshall plan. This Board would pass on worthy private investments abroad by American investors. The lending bank in America would assume 5 per cent of any loss, and the borrowing bank another 5 per cent. The 90 per cent remainder of the loan would be guaranteed by the government as in the days of war production.

2. The guaranteed loan proviso of the Marshall plan as it rests before Congress should be strengthened and broadened to include a Peace Production Board. The proviso is played down in the bill. It needs to be talked up.

And let's never forget this: economic stability is a favorable atmosphere for political stability. Our busy, hustling acquaintances behind the iron curtain know that, and they don't like it. They won't like whatever we do about it.

Every time the economic barometer in a western European nation goes up, the fortunes of communism in that country go down. We've seen that happen. I saw it myself on a recent tour of Europe.

Production—production which helps to get rid of despair and misery is the quickest way to get rid of communism. We don't get rid of communism by chucking a few communists in a concentration camp. We get rid of it by making our system work better than theirs; by giving more things, more security and more

freedoms to all people. If we perform, the beguiling promises of the communists won't win converts.

But there's this to be said for the communist. He gives more than lip service to his cause. From a capitalist's point of view, he may be a crackpot, but he's an energetic one. His trade is making capitalists unhappy, and he goes at it with the fire and zeal of a crusader. No sacrifice or inconvenience is too great for him when he's bent on winning converts or sabotaging his enemies.

We free enterprisers—all of us—have been too smug and too complacent in believing that we could have free enterprise in the world largely by talking about it. We've got to step out of our panelled offices and work up a sweat in a crusade for free enterprise and acquire some new callouses. We've got callouses, all right, but they're in the wrong places. We need to have them where they show. Most people want to be free enterprisers. It's human nature. But we've got to give them a helping hand. In doing it, we'll find we aren't making any great personal sacrifices. We'll find it to be a good business risk.

I would like to see every bank of every size in America with its foreign department eagerly seeking out men with initiative, resourcefulness and integrity to get Europe back in production. Free enterprise must sow its own seeds of its own kind. Just as American labor unions are trying to help labor re-establish free unions in Europe, American business must help European business regain its footing. The caravan of private trade in Europe is mired in the mud. What we need to do is to hitch on our draglines.

We won't do it by just talking about it. Lip service doesn't move pig iron. We don't do it by sitting on our hands and sitting on our dough.

The life blood of trade is credit and money. A restoration of private trade in Europe will be the breath of life to a continent in shambles. It will be an elixir for the spirit of man as well as for his body.

We are about to embark on an entirely new type of world leadership. We embark on it reluctantly, but we have almost unanimously made up our minds to exercise it the best we can and for the good of the world.

We aren't interested in conquest, in exploitation or in war. We are interested in peace and prosperity, and partnership is the key word in this policy.

This is the third great contribution of America to the betterment of the world. The first was the concept of the dignity of man as a citizen. We gave the idea political embodiment, writing his inalienable rights into a binding constitution with which law must conform. Then we gave the world the technique of mass production. We touched the machine with magic, and to the idea that man could have free will and free choice, we added the idea that man should have abundance with which to enjoy them. We proved it would work.

The third great contribution is a corollary of the other two. In a foreign policy

based on partnership, we recognize that political freedom and economic freedom cannot survive anywhere unless they have a chance everywhere.

In pursuit of this adventure, we will export a thousand different things, but the biggest one of all is the idea and the ideal of partnership—a working partnership for peace and a prosperity in which all peoples are partners.

QUESTIONS ON THE ADDRESS

1. Why does this speech seem extemporaneous?
2. On what proviso in the Marshall plan is this talk based?
3. What objections do bankers make to Mr. Johnston's proposal?
4. How does Mr. Johnston meet these objections?
5. What advantages does the speaker list for his proposal?
6. What is the difference between "partnership capitalism" and "old-time capitalism"?
7. How are profits and losses distributed?
8. What three "great contributions" has America made to the betterment of the world?
9. How would a "Peace Production Board" function?
10. How does Mr. Johnston's speech compare in style with Mr. Lilienthal's? (next chapter)
11. How does Mr. Johnston get attention and confidence in his opening sentences?
12. What is the speaker's attitude toward socialism in Europe?

TOPICS SUGGESTED BY THE ADDRESS

1. Our Trade with Europe
2. Tariff Restrictions
3. The Danube Waterway
4. The Berlin Crisis
5. Western Germany
6. Foreign Exchange
7. American Motion Pictures in England
8. Eastern Europe
9. Bank Credit in America
10. Farm Subsidies
11. Results of the Marshall Plan
12. American and European Trade Unions

CHAPTER VIII

HOW TO READ A SPEECH WELL

Every audience prefers to be spoken to than read at. Your own experience will tell you why. You recall how let down you felt when the speaker came forward with a thick sheaf of typed papers. You wished you could get out of there, but you were too far front. Besides, you couldn't face the reproachful glances of your fellow sufferers. So you just sat back and guessed at the number of pages you would have to sit through. There were fifteen, at least, and at three minutes a page —well,—it was almost time for lunch, and you prayed that the fellow would have some sense and cut it short.

The reading was almost as dreary as you had expected. The speech was an essay instead of talk. The sentences were long and involved; the words abstract and general instead of specific and colloquial. There were few illustrations, examples, or incidents to give the material life and color.

Once in a while the speaker looked up and added a sentence or two to make something clearer. That was encouraging, and everybody sat up, hoping for more real talk. But it wasn't to be. The reading was resumed, and the regular, monotonous droning continued.

After the first half hour the speaker got excited. He suddenly noticed that his speech was much too long, and he proceeded to race through the rest of it. The audience sympathized with this desperation and wished it could do something, such as calling out, "O.K.; just close at the next period."

No Use Condemning. There is no need to go further with this catalogue of complaints. As with the weather, everybody talks about it but nobody does anything. The reading goes on and on—more of it

every year. Commencement exercises, conventions of lawyers, doctors, teachers, businessmen, dinners with radio hookups—all put on a pressure which is almost impossible to resist.

Some Excuse. There are legitimate reasons for the type of speech that everyone condemns. There are many occasions when information must be accurate and precise, when the language should have a touch of dignity and style, when the organization of the material should be more studied, logical, and impressive. So the speech is written out and read because it is easier and safer.

It is also a fact that many men and women, prominent in their occupations, known for outstanding contributions, are still inexperienced in public speaking. They fear they will fumble and overlook important matters if they extemporize, and to memorize is still more out of the question.

Of course, there is a sense of security about the speech that is all written out and has only to be read. The speaker puts it aside for the big event and stops worrying. He can go to the meeting, enjoy himself with his colleagues, eat as much as the rest, take a drink or two if he wishes—all with the comforting assurance that his good old manuscript will take care of everything. He has sold his enterprise and salesmanship for this lulling security.

But we don't have to "give up on" the read speech. It is here to stay and it is by no means a hopeless matter. I have heard speeches read that were much more interesting than the usual run of extemporized or memorized speeches. You have heard a few fine radio talks, and they were all read. Any normal person, can, with a little thought, read a speech well enough to hold the attention of an audience.

Cut It Down. But you have to begin the process long before you reach the platform. Many good speakers are just bores when they take pen in hand. Perhaps they dictate, and then they're worse. Woodrow Wilson used to say that when he did not have time to prepare a short speech he made a long one. At least one-third of a first draft should be cut out and thrown away. It is verbiage that puts out the fire of interest. As to the length of a paper, speakers seldom time it correctly.

About 140 words a minute is what radio directors advise. At that rate most manuscripts should be considerably shorter.

Make It Talk. The next trouble with the average script is that it does not sound like talk. The writer goes "literary," dignified, and dull. His words lack the intimate, live, and practical force of conversation. He settles down into excessive explanations, arguments, and reviews. His sentences are too long and miss the easy rhythm of comfortable breathing. They tire the speaker and the audience. The words and phrases sound bookish and dead.

Give It Rhythm. The only way to correct this kind of writing is to hear it as one writes or, better still, to read it aloud. Your ear, or somebody else's, will detect clumsy or pretentious words. Your conscious management of breath will warn you against long and involved units of phraseology. Comfortable rhythm is an essential element of style, even for the article or book that is read silently. The reader, though he does not open his mouth, still moves the organs of speech more than he suspects and tires in following jerky, uneven, long, and difficult passages without pause, much as if he were reading aloud.

Learn to Read. You've got to be something of a writer and then you've got to be a bit of an actor. An actor is an actor because he can make rehearsed—"canned"—stuff fresh, spontaneous, unpremeditated, as though he were speaking the words for the first time in actual conversation. For many persons this is easy enough, but for most it has to be learned.

When radio was new, almost every speaker sounded as though he were doing just what he was doing—reading from a paper. He read along without paying any attention to stop signals. He failed to stress and inflect meaningful words. He was solemn, humorless, more to be pitied than blamed. Today very few are so amateurish. Speakers have learned about timing, phrasing, and the effective use of pause.

The radio reader, compared to the platform reader, has one big advantage. He does not need to look up from his script. In fact, he is warned not to do so because nothing is gained by it and he takes the

risk of losing his place or stumbling over words while looking off his paper.

Look Up. The reader on the platform, however, cannot afford to lose eye contact with his listeners and observers. Engaged in conversation, he must deliberately look at his audience, at all of them, with practical expression. He should not, however, mechanically look up from his paper once in a while as if to say, "See, I can do it."

The eye is eloquent. You know how futile a speech is when the speaker looks at the floor, out the window, anywhere except directly and steadily at his audience. It is as if the lights were out. The reader can succeed only when he is fully aware of his greatly reduced eye contact and does all he can to make this handicap smaller.

Know Your Script. It is not enough, then, to have your manuscript ready and to look it over just before going to the meeting. The words should be so familiar, through a number of readings, that the speaker can take in a whole line at a glance and look up and talk it with an easy assurance. He must try to get over the wall—the paper—that separates him from his audience.

The radio reader's simple method may help. He underlines words that should be stressed. He puts vertical lines after words and phrases to indicate pause. He is intent on getting life out of a lifeless paper.

None of this is difficult. It implies that you must be active and insistent on getting audience response, that you will not let the audience go to sleep because you have neglected it. You will talk so well that the paper is almost forgotten.

Read—and Published. Textbooks tend to overlook the extensive use and influence of the read speech. Aside from radio, they condemn it. Yet almost everything you read in *Vital Speeches* and other collections was written and read. You might almost think that few speeches are given in the extemporaneous manner unanimously recommended by teachers. Of course most speeches are, but they seldom get into print. The permanency of print is reserved for prominent speakers at prominent occasions, and, because a radio hookup is so often a part of the speech situation, reading is encouraged all the more.

There are still many speakers who scorn the paper no matter where they go, and audiences love them for it. The hearty, friendly talk, with its personal quality and idiom, usually makes the read speech seem comparatively remote, formal, and pallid.

Practice. If you are to have the necessary skill in reading the speech, you should practice reading aloud. Your purpose is to approximate the flexibility, ease, and attack of spontaneous, confident talk. Try yourself out on the passages given below. Look for the central idea. Be familiar with the thought of every sentence. Look up doubtful words for their meaning and pronunciation. Read aloud in private to get the characteristic mood, rhythm, ring, and projection. Hold the book up high enough so that you can look up easily and not be ducking constantly into the print.

When you face your classmates or other audience, pause a moment before you begin and look them over. Then take a quick glance at the first line, look up, and talk the line slowly and impressively. You will get interested attention at once. You have firmly planted the suggestion that what you are going to read is good and that you will reveal its values with relish.

Don't read solemnly unless the selection demands it. Take a tip from the radio announcer. He reads a great variety of scripts and takes care to assume the prevailing spirit of each. He may be gay, tender, hilarious, dramatic, cheerfully informal, as the passage requires.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Don't hammer away at the following selections. Vary the stress. Cultivate the lighter touch of pleasant, alert, interested conversation.

1. Mme. de Sévigné tells the story of a little dog that belonged to Madame, sister-in-law of Louis XIV. This little dog had one remarkable characteristic. Whenever it saw a book it would run and hide under the bed. Our population bears a distressing resemblance to this interesting animal. We spend our new and perhaps unwelcome leisure in sleep, at the movies, in playing bridge, in drinking, and in driving up and down the crowded highways, catching glimpses of the countryside between the billboards. I have tried some of these occupations and can assure you that sooner or later they begin to pall. Higher education can confer the capacity to read, to distinguish what is worth reading from what is not, to enjoy reading what is, and the habit of doing it. It can confer, too, the ability to think, to distinguish what is worth thinking about from what is not, and the habit of thinking about important things in a disciplined way.

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS.

2. It has been remarked by the celebrated Haller that we are deaf while we are yawning. The same act of drowsiness that stretches open our mouths closes our ears. It is much the same in acts of the understanding. A lazy half-attention amounts to a mental yawn. . . . When this occurs during the perusal of a work of known authority and established fame, we honestly lay the fault on our own deficiency, or on the unfitness of our present mood; but when it is a contemporary production over which we have been nodding, it is far more pleasant to pronounce it insufferably dull and obscure. Indeed, as "charity begins at home," it would be unreasonable to expect that a reader should charge himself with lack of intellect, when the effect may be equally accounted for by declaring the author unintelligible; or that he should accuse his own inattention, when by half a dozen phrases of abuse, as "heavy stuft," "metaphysical jargon," etc., he can at once excuse his laziness, and gratify his pride, scorn, and envy.

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERDIGE.

3. We are not propagandists. Wherever other systems are preferred, either as being thought better in themselves or as better suited to existing conditions, we leave the preference to be enjoyed. Our history hitherto proves, however, that the popular form is practicable and that, with wisdom and knowledge, men may govern themselves; and the duty incumbent on us is to preserve the consistency of this cheering example and take care that nothing may weaken its authority with the world. If in our case the representative system ultimately fail, popular governments must be pronounced impossible. No combination of circumstances more

favorable to the experiment can ever be expected to occur. The last hopes of mankind, therefore, rest with us; and if it should be proclaimed that our example had become an argument against the experiment, the knell of popular liberty would be sounded throughout the earth.

These are incitements to duty; but they are not suggestions of doubt. Our history and our condition, all that is gone before us and all that surrounds us, authorize the belief that popular governments, though subject to occasional variations, perhaps not always for the better form, may yet in their general character be as durable and permanent as other systems. We know, indeed, that in our country any other is impossible. The principle of free governments adheres to the American soil. It is bedded in it—immovable as its mountains.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

4. The variety of work done in any broadcasting center is astonishing. This variety is still more surprising when you take into account the fact that not many people are employed in any one broadcasting company. The whole number of workers in the field, counting everybody, is quite small. There is no reason to suppose that it will ever be very large. The total number of employees of all kinds on the payroll of the Columbia Broadcasting System, which does not count actors and musicians and free-lance writers, is now about 1,800. If we included all the people employed by the seven CBS owned and operated stations the total number would be about 2,800. The talent for our sustaining shows would include about 1,600 more. It has been estimated that the total number of people working in broadcasting for the four large networks and the 1,000 commercial stations in the whole country, still excluding the actors and free-lance writers, amounts to about 30,000 people.

The people working in radio departments of the big advertising agencies might add 1,000 more. This is not a very large number of people to carry on a whole industry of immense influence and importance. There are single corporations in the United States which have payrolls of 300,000 people, ten times as many as the whole broadcasting industry.

LYMAN BRYSON.

II. Examine the following speech. The central idea is so well put that it sounds original, and the personal, somewhat informal language is so easy and incisive that it sounds eloquent. The style is friendly, comfortably rhythmic, characterized by a clear insight expressed in terms and illustrations at once understandable and pleasing to the listener.

This is good talk, although it may have been written out and read. The occasional repetition and restatement, the use of *I, we, it's, fussing, fix, jitters,* the little interruptions, the loose but flowing sentence structure, the colloquial

phrases, suggest extemporaneous speaking. The speaker never gets out of touch with his audience.

Of course there are signs that the material was carefully worked over. The genial but impressive analogy in the introduction, the maturely considered paradox of the cart-before-the-horse, the precise and vital statement, the apt and striking conclusion—a quotation from Walt Whitman—all hint at painstaking, skillful writing. But it is the art that conceals art. There is nothing heavy or labored, there is no strain or artifice. Everything is cheerful, and the light touch of assurance is exhilarating.

Yes, it takes time to acquire knowledge, experience, confidence, but you will write well when you sound like yourself. You wish to sound better than that, and you will as you keep evolving into new selves through study and growth. Be self-reliant, have a little good-tempered audacity, and your style will take care of itself. Style is still the man.

THE BASES OF OUR NATION'S STRENGTH[1]

By David E. Lilienthal, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, delivered at the *New York Herald Tribune* Forum, New York, Oct. 21, 1947

Generally speaking it's not a good idea for an individual to think too much about himself. He can become so occupied with how his digestion is getting along that just fussing about it will get it out of fix. Perfectly healthy people can give themselves the jitters by paying too much attention to their nerves and their mental processes. The advice "Let your mind alone" has a lot to be said for it.

I have a feeling that much the same thing applies to nations, and particularly to a nation as healthy and high-spirited as the United States of America. But a certain amount of national self-examination is inescapable, and, indeed, at this juncture in world events, it is not only inevitable but wholesome. The eyes of the world's peoples are upon us these days. Everything we do (and a good many things we don't do) and much of what we say, in this wonderfully talkative and uninhibited land of ours, occupies the attention of hundreds of millions of people in England, in France and the Lowlands, in Italy and the Balkans, in Latin America, in the vast reaches of Soviet Russia. So that even though we might prefer not to talk about our own health, about what it is that makes us so fit, or about that occasional headache, the times just won't permit.

Each day all over the world, we the people of the United States are given a physical and mental appraisal by the people of other lands. Some of this "going-

[1] Reprinted by courtesy of *Vital Speeches of the Day*.

over" is so palpably false, so coarse and downright mean that it shocks most of us; for very few of us are given to such extremely bad manners when we talk about other peoples.

But whether the looking over we are getting around the world is sincere and temperate—as it often is—or deliberately false, and incredibly mean—as much of it is—the justification for this constant appraisal of America is clear enough. For we no longer say, "Our way is good enough for us; please go away and don't bother us with your problems." Upon a world-wide stage we stand today as the exemplars and the active protagonists of certain heroic principles of human life, about which we feel so deeply that we are prepared to stake everything upon keeping them alive and flourishing. We assert that the principles by which we live are basically opposed to and demonstrably superior to those modern versions of tyranny over men that first enslaved and then destroyed the German and the Japanese people, and that now threaten the peoples of all Europe and of Asia.

If I understand the essence of our evolving foreign policy, it is based largely upon what we believe to be the peculiar merits and the superior qualities of our domestic policy, that is, our way of living together here at home. The anxious peoples of the world are bedeviled and often confused by many voices in their own lands, telling them just what America is like, what our motives are. The confusion abroad is natural enough. But we should take care that we ourselves do not get confused about the sources of our strength, about what it is that makes America strong and that will keep her strong.

What is this source and this foundation of our American strength? The answer most commonly heard is: our economic system. This "system" is variously referred to as the capitalist system, or democratic capitalism, or the system of free enterprise, or some similar expression.

The central role of free, competitive, private enterprise in the life of America can hardly be exaggerated. But neither this nor any other answer in economic terms can explain our basic vitality.

The basic source of the strength of American civilization does not lie in an "economic system." The wellsprings of our vitality are not economic. They go deeper still: they are ethical and spiritual. Our society in America is founded not upon the cold and bloodless "economic man" of the Marxist, but upon a faith in man as an end in himself. We believe in man. We believe in men not merely as production units, but as the children of God. We believe that the purpose of our society is not primarily to assure the safety of the state but to safeguard human dignity and the freedom of the individual. We are a people who have built upon a faith in the spirit of man, who conceive that the development and happiness of the individual is the purpose and goal of American life. I judge that we are not ready to trade in this luminous concept of a people's purpose for the notion that

the America of the Bill of Rights, of Walt Whitman and Justice Holmes and Abraham Lincoln, is simply a highly productive economic system.

What we have, actually, is not a system at all, but almost its opposite, that is, a society of the greatest imaginable diversity and flexibility, taking things as they come, deciding how to handle situations by the facts of each situation itself--"doing what comes naturally." The only way in which it can be said to be a "system" is to say that our "system" is to have no system.

What I have said may start an argument, but it will not be merely an argument over the meaning of words. I speak of the substance of things. I am asserting that the vitality of our distinctive institutions of production and distribution of goods ultimately depends not upon rigid and fixed economic principles but upon ethical and moral assumptions and purposes; that our unparalleled productivity and standard of living are not the consequence of an economic system, but rather the other way around; that our economic success and our flourishing economic institutions are the consequence of our ethical and moral standards and precepts, of our democratic faith in man.

We have ethical guide lines in this country. We have developed rather highly a sense of what is right and what is wrong, of what is fair and decent, and what is just crude use of arbitrary power. A cynical labor leader or business giant, a cynical politician or public official—those who conceive of American society as nothing more than a jungle in which the most ruthless prevails—we may not catch on to such men right away. We can be fooled for a time by a mask of pretense. Sometimes we are slow to repudiate cynical disregard of our democratic faith—but that faith is always there, the foundation of our buying and selling, our hiring and firing, our political and financial institutions. No factory can be operated, not a carload of wheat sold, not a labor dispute negotiated, not an election held, that these ethical, legally unenforceable precepts are not part of the transaction.

I do not see how our kind of society could flourish in any other way. A highly interdependent country, one capable of producing more than $150,000,000,000 worth of goods a year is too complex for rigid planning and the enforcement of detailed plans by law. We must function in a loose, informal way under sanctions that are largely ethical and moral, based upon commonly accepted standards of fair play and respect for human integrity. This is the way we do function, by and large, and this is why we flourish.

Some would have us believe that because we excel in making millions of the same kind of useful gadgets, that therefore we are free men. No, that has the cart before the horse. It is because freedom for men is a primary ethical concern of ours that we do so well in making gadgets and raising food and doing successfully many other things—among them the winning of wars.

Diversity and flexibility, rather than a stereotyped hard-and-fast system, is an

essential part of such a noble concept of society as is ours. We get our economic services in the way that at the time seems to work best, that will in a particular situation best advance our underlying purposes. We do not start with all the answers, the economic or political answers. We make the answers up as we go along. Thus, American industry is owned and operated, by and large, by competitive private enterprise; yet a year ago the Senate of the United States voted unanimously to establish public ownership and management in one of our largest industries, and make it a government monopoly—I refer of course to the atomic materials industry. That appeared to be the thing to do at the time, for reasons related to the facts of atomic energy, not for ideological reasons taken out of some book of economic dogma. The most rock-ribbed Mid-Western town I know has for many years owned and operated its own electric power and light plant. Is this then a "socialist" town? Hardly! Its water service has been privately owned for the same period. There is a privately owned university; a public junior college. No one considers that these things are inconsistent; and of course they are not, except to the dogmatist who thinks we have a fixed "system." In the same town there is a farmer's feed co-operative that is not quite private or quite public, operating side by side with a big privately owned feed company. There are private banks, there are non-profit insurance companies, there are state-owned liquor stores. We would never consider adopting government ownership or control of newspapers partly because of their educational character; but our school system, the cornerstone of American education, is almost entirely publicly owned and managed. This is all part of the familiar picture of American diversity, of American flexibility.

The fact is that we have hardly an ounce of economic dogmatism in us. This characteristic diversity of ours, this capacity to adapt ourselves to any need stands us—and the world—in good stead tonight. For in western Europe there are different kinds of economic undertakings and methods of controls; and, as befits world leaders, we are peculiarly equipped by reason of our own economic versatility to deal effectively and with each of these, without sacrifice of our own unifying sense of purpose and direction.

We ourselves should be very clear about American fundamentals, as we move into the most fateful role we have ever played in world affairs. For our leadership in large part depends upon our continued capacity to demonstrate how superior, in human terms, is our way of living. If I am right in what I have been saying, then it is important—desperately important—that we be clear in our own minds about the true sources of our strength; that we nourish and safeguard the ethical principles that make us strong.

Now no candid person—no honest person—would deny that there are today some disturbing tendencies in our country away from this concern for the indi-

vidual, away from our standards of fairness between men. We are witnessing in some quarters as ugly a scene of hoggishness and money-mania as we have seen since the days of the twenties. Many of those who spent the years of their youth fighting for this country returned to find themselves the victims of legal crookedness and outrageous speculation. These and other evidences of disregard for our ethical precepts do exist in some quarters; and to the extent that they exist they poison the wells of our material as well as our spiritual strength.

These are days when we should recall the stirring words of old Walt Whitman:

> It is not the earth, it is not America who is so great,
> It is I who am great or to be great, it is You up there, or any one,
> It is to walk rapidly through civilization, governments, theories,
> Through poems, pageants, shows, to form individuals.
> Underneath all, individuals, I swear nothing is good to me now that ignores individuals.

QUESTIONS ON THE ADDRESS

1. What analogy does Mr. Lilienthal use to make an effective beginning?
2. What are foreigners saying about us?
3. Why must we "talk about our own health"?
4. Why are foreigners confused about America?
5. What is the source of "our American strength"?
6. Why are "the wellsprings of our vitality not economic"?
7. Why is it correct to say, "Our system is to have no system"?
8. Why is our standard of living "not the consequence of an economic system"?
9. Why is this country wrongly called materialistic?
10. How does the speaker illustrate our "diversity and flexibility"?
11. What enterprises, in your opinion, should be publicly owned and managed?
12. What elements of suggestion and drama make this speech effective?

TOPICS SUGGESTED BY THE ADDRESS

1. "Hoggishness and Money-mania"
2. Men, not Masses
3. Walt Whitman
4. Clear in Our Own Minds
5. Control of Newspapers
6. The Voice of America
7. Cooperatives
8. Centralized Planning

9. Invention and War Strategy
10. Production Problems
11. Government Ownership
12. "Dixiecrats"

MORE TOPICS FOR TALKS

1. The Santa Fe Trail
2. The Cults of California
3. Show Business
4. Grass Roots
5. Distemper
6. Penicillin
7. What's Wrong with Management?
8. Enough to Eat
9. Selling across the Counter
10. Winter Sports
11. Carnival
12. Columns and Columnists
13. Lost and Found
14. Allen's Alley
15. You Are What You Eat
16. Kitchen Clinic
17. A Vacation at Home
18. Where Living Is Cheaper
19. Pioneering in Business
20 Pull and Push
21. Taking Chances
22. Perspective in Life
23. The Vitality of Ideals
24. Boom or Bust
25 Continuing to Learn
26 Espionage
27. The Japanese Beetle
28. Sky Writing
29. Rose Bowl
30. Farm Machines

CHAPTER IX

TRAINING THE SPEAKER'S MIND

The special training of the public speaker must rest upon the broad foundation of a liberal education. How often the expert engineer, chemist, manufacturer, or retailer gives a dry-as-dust speech. He has dug deep into his subject but has little knowledge of his audience, of human nature. He lacks the warmth, the expansiveness, the intimate and enjoyable contact with men and women that comes from interest in subjects and ideas comparatively remote from his bread-and-butter occupation. The specialist frequently seems a vacuum when in the company of those not engaged in his kind of study. He has not learned how to be interested in persons and how to interest them. The experienced traveler is usually a good companion. Travel in the world of ideas, in the experiences of men of genius, of humor, of charm and sympathy, of good sense and sober learning, makes one still more adaptable and understanding, more at home and more welcome in every company. Flexibility and growth are the distinguishing traits of a soundly trained mind.

Human Interest. Huxley was a great scientist and a fine public speaker. He gave fascinating descriptions and explanations of the doctrine of evolution to enthusiastic audiences of workmen. His printed speeches are widely read today. They have a simplicity, directness, and energy that make them models of style. Huxley knew how to tell, how to teach and inspire, because his scientific curiosity touched eagerly everything that is of interest to man. That is what Cicero meant when he said that the orator must be acquainted with all the arts and sciences. Among businessmen today we have many good speakers, and you will note that almost without exception they have, besides their business, many other resources of stimulating talk.

The Force of Habit. But whether we intend to be speakers or not, this active, widely ranging attention to the world in which we all live is necessary for the exercise of our more intelligent thinking. The psychologist tells us that man's mind, like that of the animals, is naturally indolent. Thinking is hard work. The employer corroborates this in his assertion that most employees stop growing after two or three years' familiarity with the job. The mind is simply a collection of habits. Habit is repetition that has become mechanical. One operates a typewriter or a sewing machine automatically. And this is the most economical, efficient way. But this habit-forming tendency invades the upper reaches of thought as well. Teachers fail to grow, says Thorndike, after five or six years of experience. Familiarity makes less and less demand upon our conscious attention, and the grooves of habit are dug deeper and deeper. All of us are in greater or less degree victims of our habits. We need to form the best habit of breaking through the crusts of unintelligent, habitualized thinking. So get interested in something different or get a fresh grip on the old, examine it more consciously. Open the mind, renovate it, and do not seal it again. Nothing is final. Keep your senses pleasurably alert and receptive to new impressions, new truth. Life is an adventure, not a story that is told.

Sources of Ideas. We get our ideas from our environment—our companions, books, neighborhood, and occupation. They make us what we are. They give us our "set" of mind, our attitudes and prejudices. The criminal can with considerable justice blame society for what he is. So can the judge, the lawyer, and everybody else. But we can often modify our environment or leave it for a better one. Education is the greatest force in bringing this about.

What to Read. Books are wonderful in making a magic and yet a very real environment. Those who speak to us through them are more intimate and have more influence over us than our living companions. "Tell me what you read," observed Goethe, "and I will tell you what you are." Because our experience is so limited and because books interpret the experiences of thousands of years, we naturally learn most

from them. Carlyle says, "The true University of these days is a collection of books, and all education is to teach us how to read."

Centuries ago Bacon complained that of the making of books there is no end. Today the condition is immeasurably more appalling and bewildering. Yet we must choose rightly the books needed for our nourishment and learn to use them skillfully.

Do not plod through one book or a collection of books just because they have been highly recommended to you or have deservedly worldwide reputation. Many ambitious readers have suffered mental indigestion and permanent discouragement from books unsuited to their nature or stage of development. The first requirement of profitable reading is interest—as it is of all education. If the words fail to hold your active attention, if they bore you, the book is not for you. Of course you must give a book a reasonable trial. Even if the first chapter is a little painful, the second may strike a spark that may generate a lasting fire of enthusiasm. But in the high schools and colleges many students have acquired an everlasting dislike for the finer types of drama, essay, poetry, and fiction simply because their immature minds were not ready to grapple with the humor, the irony, the philosophy, the reflections, of maturity. Years of experience, of disillusion, of suffering and renewed faith are sometimes necessary for the comprehension and realization of the commonplace truths of the copybook. But even trained, educated readers differ widely in tastes and prejudices. To one, Dostoevski is a neurotic, a diseased, hopeless subject for the pathologist; to another, a torch of light and warmth. Just as our natures differ, they demand different nourishment, and you will prefer some fine books to others perhaps greater. But you should try to appreciate the values of all. Only sympathetic communion with great minds as revealed in their best books can give you the larger understanding, the perspective, that is a part of culture.

Two Kinds of Books. Books are readily separated into two classes, those of information and those of inspiration. De Quincey has put this distinction most effectively in a famous passage. He says:

There is the literature of knowledge and there is the literature of power. The function of the first is to teach; the function of the second is to move. The first is a rudder; the second, an oar or a sail. The first speaks to the mere discursive understanding; the second speaks, ultimately it may happen, to the higher understanding or reason, but always through affections of pleasure and sympathy.

What do you learn from *Paradise Lost?* Nothing at all. What do you learn from a cookery-book? Something new—something that you did not know before, in every paragraph. But would you therefore put the wretched cookery-book on a higher level of estimation than the divine poem? What you owe to Milton is not any knowledge, of which a million separate items are still but a million of advancing steps on the same earthly level; what you owe is power, that is, exercise and expansion to your own latent capacity of sympathy with the infinite, where every pulse and each separate influx is a step upwards—a step ascending as upon a Jacob's ladder from earth to mysterious altitudes above the earth. All the steps of knowledge, from first to last, carry you further on the same plane, but could never raise you one foot above your ancient level of earth: whereas the very first step in power is a flight—is an ascending movement into another element where earth is forgotten.

Ruskin may help you to realize this passage a little more fully. In an address to an audience of mechanics and other practical workers (see "Sesame and Lilies") he said:

Books are divisible into two classes,—the books of the hour, and the books of all time.

The good book of the hour, then,—I do not speak of the bad ones—is simply the useful or pleasant talk of some person whom you cannot otherwise converse with, printed for you. Very useful often, telling you what you need to know; very pleasant often, as a sensible friend's present talk would be. These bright accounts of travels; good-humored and witty discussions of questions; lively or pathetic story-telling in the form of a novel; firm fact-telling, by the real agents concerned in the events of passing history;—all these books of the hour, multiplying among us as education becomes more general, are a peculiar possession of the present age. We ought to be entirely thankful for them, and entirely ashamed of ourselves if we make no good use of them. But we make the worst possible use if we allow them to usurp

the place of true books; for strictly speaking, they are not books at all, but merely letters or newspapers in good print.

The book of talk is printed. Why? Because its author cannot speak to thousands of people at once; if he could he would—the volume is mere multiplication of his voice. . . . But a book is written not to multiply the voice merely, not to carry it merely, but to perpetuate it. The author has something to say which he perceives to be true and useful, or helpfully beautiful. . . . Whatever bit of a wise man's work is honestly and benevolently done, that bit is his book, or his piece of art. It is mixed always with evil fragments,—ill done, affected, redundant work. But if you read rightly, you will easily discover the true bits, and those *are* the book.

Now books of this kind have been written in all ages by their greatest men, by great readers, great statesmen, and great thinkers. These are all at your choice; and Life is short. You have heard as much before; yet have you measured and mapped out this short life and its possibilities? Do you know, if you read this, that you cannot read that; that what you lose today you cannot gain tomorrow? Will you go and gossip with your housemaid or your stable-boy when you may talk with queens and kings; or flatter yourselves that it is with any worthy consciousness of your own claims to respect that you jostle with the hungry and common crowd for entree here, and audience there, when all the while this eternal court is open to you, with its society wide as the world, multitudinous as its days—the chosen and the mighty of every place and time?

Reading Lists. *The Saturday Review of Literature,* the book review sections of the Sunday *New York Times,* the *New York Herald Tribune,* and other well-known newspapers will often give you valuable suggestions for reading. Reading about books is sometimes characterized as a waste of time, but the famous critics and essayists introduce books to us so attractively that we are tempted to read them. Make reading lists for yourself. Promise to read certain books in the next three months or six months or year. History, science, fiction, philosophy, and poetry mean much to you in a practical way. Napoleon said historians are liars, and Henry Ford characterized history as "bunk," but if the world had only studied its history as intelligently, as practically, as it studies business, it might have been spared the calamities in which it wallows

today. If you wish to see a panorama of the ages, to hear the story of man who slowly evolved from the fish—not another fish story—and now aspires to the stars, read the fascinating narrative of H. G. Wells in "The Outline of History." It will help you to get your bearings in the world. The best of our present-day writers will show you the way to the delightful reading of the masters of the past. You will be struck by the fact that our life has its roots deep down in the generations forgotten as bunk. Abraham, Confucius, Socrates, Shakespeare, and Lincoln were gentlemen who would have had no difficulty, as Samuel Crothers has said, in understanding one another.

Biography. Biography is one of the most practical fields of study for the public speaker. Nothing is of keener interest to audiences than the stories of how great men met the difficulties of living. We are always more interested in people than in things. Biography throws a warmer and more penetrating light upon history. Its gossip makes the past real and near.

Vocational Reading. The broad-minded man must be sharpened to the point required for scratching a living. Whether he is a teacher, lawyer, doctor, or businessman he must be abreast of the theory and practice of his occupation. He must have skill not only in living, but in getting his living. He will have a library of his business, he will be familiar with the trade journals, house organs, and other papers of his craft or profession. This paragraph might be taken for granted were it not for the fact that probably the majority of professional men do little reading about the theory, philosophy, or practice of their vocations after they have graduated from the schools. Their own experience and contact with others in the same work become their only guides. These are most important, to be sure, but they are so close to everyone that it is sometimes hard to see the forest for the trees. At the end of this chapter are short lists of books and magazines which will yield excellent material for talks with friends or to clubs or classes.

How to Read. This brings us to the question how to read. Francis Bacon in his essay "Of Studies" says: "Read not to contradict, nor to

believe, but to weigh and consider." Most readers, if they understand at all, give themselves up completely to the author. One should, of course, give him a sympathetic reading, try to understand his point of view, but not believe him until the thought has been examined in the light of one's own experience. Almost everybody is in awe of print. The use of the word "propaganda" during the war and since has done much to mitigate the tyranny of books and papers. What one reads is not necessarily so.

Challenging "Facts." This is especially true of chains of reasoning. In such instances the reader owes it to his self-respect to challenge, refute, or approve the logic—to be reasonably sure the writer has established his case. Even facts, for which we have to depend upon observers and students from all over the world, can be reported to prove contradictory ideas. "Figures don't lie, but liars can figure." Many "facts" are not facts at all. Many arguments, many speeches, are based upon such facts—upon unsound premises, upon things taken for granted that need close examination. The reader or listener is seldom attentive enough to introductory paragraphs or remarks. If these are accepted without thought, the whole of a false plea or doctrine or argument will often be accepted. G. K. Chesterton in his lecture "The Ignorance of the Educated" quotes Artemus Ward, who said, "The trouble with people is they know too many things that ain't so." We talk of "half-baked ideas." They are usually the other fellow's.

Newspaper Editorials. The easiest exercise in discovering fallacies may be had with newspaper editorials. These are often written to be consistent with a known attitude or policy in regard to public questions. Some newspapers have a consistent prejudice against the Republican party or the Democratic party, or they may be consistently conservative, liberal, or radical. Special pleaders seek to justify themselves, not necessarily to discover the truth. That is the trouble with consistency or dogma. It does not allow one to change one's mind, to face squarely and with easy conscience changing conditions or important additions to knowledge that may demand amendment to preconceived

opinions. We believe those things we wish to be true and we read what confirms our beliefs. Read the papers and the editorials opposed to your views and try to find the fallacies in their reasoning.

Informal, good-natured discussion is excellent for clarifying and testing one's opinions. Formal debate is even better for compelling a close scrutiny of the other side. Controversy, when it is not acrimonious, makes the mind more elastic and is fine practice in quick and accurate thinking.

Saving Time. One of the chief problems in study is to learn to economize time. Obviously one should not spend as much time upon a detective story as upon a classic novel. Nobody has put this thought more compactly or completely than Bacon. He says:

> Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested: that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read but cursorily, and some few to be read wholly, and with diligence and attention.

Skill, then, in the use of books is a prime factor in education, and surprisingly rare. Boswell was astonished at the way Johnson "tore the heart out of a book." Others have been born with the art, or have acquired it, of reading the most in the shortest time. Lyman Abbot in "Silhouettes of My Contemporaries" has this to say of Henry Ward Beecher:

> As a student he had extraordinary facility in the use of books. "One does not read a book through," he once said to me. "You read a book as you eat a fish; cut off the tail, cut off the head, cut off the fins, take out the backbone and there is a little meat left which you eat because it nourishes you." . . . I took over to him one day a new volume in philosophy . . . I wanted to get his estimate upon it. He took the book with him to the dinner table and read while he ate, turning over the leaves with remarks such as: "Nonsense! Of course . . . Everybody knows that . . . Borrowed from Spurzheim . . . That's new and well worth thinking about." At the end of the meal he had finished the book and handed it back to me with a ten-minute comment which made the basis of my editorial review.

Skillful Selection. Psychologists have been experimenting with students to find something practical about the rate of speed in reading. Interesting comparisons can no doubt be made to show how much faster than others some read a given passage and express accurately the content, but it is doubtful whether any method or device can help the individual more than the usual practice and experience. Expert readers are those who show common sense in the matter of selection. If they are looking for specific facts they take the short cuts to the information. They are not like so many young debaters who waste hours in floundering through discouraging masses of material. Efficient reading is often only a matter of examining the table of contents or the index for a clue, of reading the preface for the author's purpose or point of view, of noting the chapter headings, of looking for summaries at the ends of chapters. Opening or closing sentences of paragraphs often contain the gist of the matter. Training the eye in looking for key nouns and verbs as one glances down the page is helpful. Even good books contain much material irrelevant to the purpose of the reader, and many are padded with material that is of interest to but few. Other chapters are useful, but the student has perhaps read fully on the subject in other books.

Accuracy. In this business of stripping a book, the reader must not, of course, overlook its kernel. He must make haste carefully. All this strategy is preliminary to the study which must be unhurried and concentrated. No indifferent dawdling or cramming will serve here. Ruskin is our most eloquent preacher on this text. Listen to him:

> First of all I tell you earnestly and authoritatively (I *know* I am right in this) you must get into the habit of looking intensely at words, and assuring yourself of their meaning, syllable by syllable—nay, letter by letter.
>
> If you read ten pages of a good book letter by letter, that is to say, with real accuracy, you are forever more, in some measure, an educated person. The entire difference between education and non-education (as regards the merely intellectual part of it) consists in this accuracy.

And this is just what the schools and colleges are apparently not able to teach. They are too crowded to search the individual mind suf-

ficiently. Time and teachers are not available. Garfield's ideal education, "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and I on the other," is no mere flourish of enthusiasm for the Williams professor.

Reading Not Enough. Books alone will not make the trained thinker and speaker. Even if the student does not need the interpretation given by another's voice, he may be steeped too much in books. He must have considerable contact with men and affairs if he would have confidence, fluency, and precision of speech. Here again Bacon's sententious wisdom is enlightening: "Reading maketh a full man, conference [conversation] a ready man, and writing an exact man."

Conversation. Conversation is not generally thought of as educational. It implies idle chatter or, at best, recreation. And yet that earnest scholar and man of the world, Mahaffy, wrote:

> Many men and many women owe the whole of a great success in life to this and nothing else. . . .
>
> And though men are supposed to succeed in life by dead knowledge, or by acquaintance with business, it is often by their social qualities, by their agreeable way of putting things, and not by their more ponderous merits, that they prevail.

Conversation gives us opportunity to test the ideas gained from books. It is often humiliating but salutary to try to tell or explain our thought. We find it is vague or confused or incomplete. Making it clear to another clarifies it for us. "Teaching teaches teachers." Better still if the listener disagrees. He compels us to bring forth illustrations, analogies, proofs, colorful and forceful speech. Benjamin Franklin, in his "Autobiography," speaks of the valuable training he got in his conversation with his young friend Collins. They used to walk in the woods on Sundays and talk for hours of their reading and their opinions on current events. They disagreed on their most interesting topics and so had delightful tussles which exhilarated both their minds and bodies. Many college students have testified to getting more of permanent value in conversation with their instructors or their fellow students about their work than in the formal courses of study. This was indeed the method of the ancient Greeks. Socrates, the father of dialectics, questioned his

small group of pupils, made them confess their lack of logic, and in informal discussion led them to sound thinking. The Great Teacher exalted conversation as education. Jesus trained his ignorant fishermen and artisans to direct the greatest educational movement in history.

Leaders in modern history have given eloquent testimony to the value of conversation with all classes of people. Gladstone, Palmerston, Fox, Patrick Henry, Clay, Lincoln, were always practical and had a cosmopolitan interest in men and women. They learned from the farmer, the laborer, the storekeeper, from the traveler, the diplomat, and the scientist. Webster said, "Converse, *converse,* CONVERSE, with living men, face to face, mind to mind—that is one of the best sources of knowledge."

"Talking Shop." Although talking business at lunch is often condemned, it is much more stimulating and beneficial than the trivial chatter that usually takes its place. We all talk shop because it is most interesting to us. No group is much superior to any other in this respect. The shop talk of the actor, the professor, the student, the businessman, may be equally informing and inspiring, or profitless and dull. It is all a matter of the persons conversing. If they refrain from heated or long-winded argument, if they are good-humored, spontaneous, and yet considerate of each one's desire to be heard, wit, philosophy, and sound business sense, and often specific suggestions of immediate cash value, may result. Many a congenial party makes the lunch hour yield splendid returns in recreation and business.

That fine talker, Robert Louis Stevenson, did not exaggerate the value of conversation, in these words:

> The first duty of a man is to speak; that is his chief business in the world; and talk, which is the harmonious speech of two or more, is by far the most accessible of pleasures. It costs nothing; it is all profit; it completes our education; it founds and fosters our friendships; and it is by talk alone that we learn our period and ourselves.

Writing. Do not overlook the value of writing for clear and specific thinking. "Writing maketh an exact mind." Practice with the pen makes for firmness, precision, and elegance in speech. It makes a man more

conscious of the tools of language and forms the habit of noting words and their individual effectiveness. It teaches conciseness, saying no more than is necessary; and at the same time, expansiveness, developing an idea so that its details, illustrations, and proof are distinct and impressive.

Writing is also a great aid to the memory. The very act of putting words and thoughts on paper concentrates our active attention upon them and makes them much easier to recall. Try the experiment on a poem or other passage you wish to memorize and you will be convinced of its saving in time and effort.

Confident and skillful speech is certainly promoted by writing. Method and organization are stressed, and the making of neat and logical reports becomes a necessary satisfaction rather than the bugbear that it is to so many executives.

And, finally, the pen induces a deeper and broader reflection. "If Winter Comes" has this illuminating advice of the old professor of philosophy to the boys in the Tadborough School:

> And a very good thing (he used to say), an excellent thing, the very best of practices, is to write a little every day. Just a little scrap, but cultivate the habit of doing it every day. I don't mean what is called keeping a diary, you know. Don't write what you do. There's no benefit in that. We do things for all kinds of reasons and it's the reasons, not the things, that matter. But what you think is you yourself: you write it down and there it is, a tiny little bit of you that you can look at and say, "Well, really!" You see, a little bit like that, written every day, is a mirror in which you can see yourself and correct your real self.

Observation. The good talker not only reads and writes and converses, but he is thoroughly alive physically. His five senses are keen because he allows them to function. Comparatively few note with genuine attention what does not pertain to their immediate concern. Their natural curiosity has been dulled by routine, worry, indifferent health. Sight is usually the most active sense, but it tells us only a fraction of what it would if we paid attention. What do you see in your daily walk? The familiar exercise of looking into a store window, turn-

ing away, and trying to recall as many objects as possible, is good We do overlook many things. And what is worse we do not see straight. The psychologists delight in staging unexpected and somewhat exciting scenes before their pupils to test their accuracy. It is amusing and astonishing to compare their versions of what happened. Glaring inconsistencies, oversight, and misunderstanding are common. These tests give us light on the testimony of witnesses in court. They do not lie so often as they fail to observe truly.

Discrimination. Important differences and comparisons escape the average eye. Patience and training are required to develop the clear sight that De Maupassant declares is a mark of originality. He says:

> When one has something to express, he must look at it so long and with such close attention that he discovers in it some aspect that has not been seen and expressed by anyone else. In everything there is something of the unexplored, because we are accustomed to use our eyes only in connection with our memory of what has been thought before us on the subject we contemplate. The least object contains a little of the unknown. Let us find it. In order to describe a fire that flames and a tree on the plain, let us stay in the presence of that fire and that tree until they have ceased to resemble, for us, any other tree or any other fire.

The Efficiency Expert. Concentration, penetration, and sincerity are very rare and are traits of only the superior mind. However much the efficiency expert has been execrated, he has to develop this skill in seeing important practical advantages that everybody else overlooks. His mind and sight are not obscured by what he thinks he ought to see or by what others have seen. Bias, tradition, or authoritative opinion cannot swerve him from his habit of looking patiently and enthusiastically for distinguishing marks. And what he finds is usually so obvious—after he calls our attention to it—that we wonder at the blindness of the many individuals who have been looking at it for years without seeing it.

Observation is simply another good habit of the trained mind. Most of us can observe closely on a special occasion or by special incentive, but we do not do it regularly, by second nature, *habitually*. Now that employers encourage their employees to offer suggestions, to look for

better ways of doing things, we see the office boy, the clerk, the machinist, observing many a detail with as keen an eye and resourceful a mind as the specialist.

Public speakers are persuasive when they speak for themselves. When their talk is charged with personal observation and comment, when they have seen for themselves as well as through the eyes of writers, they acquire a power of their own.

Reflection. We have to interpret all that comes to us through the senses. What does it mean? What can we do with it? How does it affect us, and through us, others? We pass judgment consciously or unconsciously, carefully or superficially.

Reflection, seeing again in the mind's eye the images that flash before us, pondering, weighing, analyzing, comparing, reviewing, summarizing—this is the process by which we turn back the reel or the record in order that we may understand it and apply its lesson to ourselves. Without observation or concentration and reflection, man is a mere sieve. Ideas simply pass through him. They fail to take root or, to change the figure, to become blood and tissue. They fail to make somebody, and to be somebody is to be a personality.

Originality. In a larger sense that is all there is to originality—assimilating impressions and ideas so that they have a fresh and special meaning. Sarcey describes it as follows:

> Originality consists not in thinking new things, but in thinking for yourself things that thousands of generations have thought before you. . . . Your passion goes out to what you have discovered. You will put into its expression a good faith, a sincerity, a transport, the heat of which will be communicated to the public. . . . Everyone has said it! So much the better, because there is some chance that your audience will be enchanted, seeing you plunged up to your ears in the truth. But everyone has not said it as you will say it; for you will say it as you have thought it, and you have thought it yourself. . . .
>
> I do not know who has said that the commonplace is the body and soul of eloquence. This is a great truth. But it is necessary to rethink the commonplace for one's self, to recast it, in some way, in the image of one's own mind.

Esenwein, in "How to Attract and Hold an Audience," gives these questions as a test of originality:

> How does my mind act when it receives new truth?
>
> Does it enjoy the truth, and then give it out again unaltered, in exactly or substantially the same words?
>
> Does my mind feel stimulated, upon receiving truth, to produce other thoughts, and yet utter the received truth without change? That is expansion.
>
> Does my mind not only receive a stimulus from new truth, but also assimilate it, transform, clarify, and amplify it, so that in uttering that truth I utter it stamped with my own image and superscription? That is originality.

Imagination. The fruit of originality is imagination. This should not be mistaken for the fancy of the poet or the novelist. It may include that, but it means rather the power to interpret real and present conditions and to determine with sound judgment and clear vision how they will affect the future. Imagination is practical, but it sees deeper and farther. It is independent, daring, hopeful, and awake to opportunity.

Thomas A. Edison is reported to have said:

> The college men I have usually show lack of imagination. They scarcely have any suggestions to make in their daily routine which might lead to improvement in their various departments.

It is this imagination that makes the successful manufacturer, salesman, stock-market manipulator, general, statesman, and orator.

The public speaker of imagination knows his audience and enjoys it. He is robust and convivial, sensible and sensitive. He can readily put himself in another's place. He has a sympathy that helps him to understand and respect a point of view even when he is firmly opposed to it. He learns something and gives something every day. He is a true prophet and not without honor in his own country.

Illustration. The speech that follows shows with practical eloquence why a liberal culture is necessary to the businessman. President Lowell was himself a scholar and a businessman. Notice how he got on common ground with his Chamber of Commerce audience and spoke to

them with easy frankness on the differences between practical education and intellectual education. Lowell amplified Edison's remarks about imagination. He called it seeing the problem, resourcefulness.

This speech is a good example of the kind that is never "dated." The material is timeless—as pertinent and interesting today as it was when delivered years ago and as vital, it is safe to say, for the rest of this century.

THE COLLEGE FACTORY

By A. Lawrence Lowell, former President of Harvard University, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, Nov. 14, 1928

I was asked to say something about the relation of colleges to business, but if I may be permitted I should rather talk about business—my business—for I am a manufacturer, as my forebears were before me, and I want to advertise. No; that is not the proper word; I want to let people know the quality of the goods that we produce.

My forebears made cotton goods. The concern that I belong to has a different kind of product, but it is an old and well-established concern; it is the oldest corporation now existing in the United States. In eight years the business will be three hundred years old, which is more, I think, than any here.

What we produce is men. I am speaking not of the professional schools, but simply of the college. We make men. It is a curious product, one that we cannot standardize, because it is a biological product and therefore it cannot be wholly standardized. Nevertheless, there are different grades in the goods we produce and one of the difficulties we find is in marketing—that business men are very apt to prefer our second-class goods and then complain that they are not first rate.

I remember some years ago a business man said to me: "You are not teaching your students as you ought to. A good many of them go into brokers' offices and they sell stocks and bonds to their fathers' friends, but they do not progress much." I began to think that over and said: "If you let us do what all other manufacturers do—recommmend our own goods—you will find a very different result."

Walter Gifford has made some very interesting statistics, which he pub-

lished in *Harper's Magazine* and which, perhaps, some of you have seen. He employs some thousands of college graduates and it occurred to him that, being an honor graduate from college himself, he might see how other men did in relation to their rank in college. He graded these men for the periods they had been in his employ and compared that with the rank they had obtained while in college, and he found that for the five first years, while men were learning their business, there was little difference; but from that time on the better students in college got larger salaries.

By the way, the comparison was wholly made not by estimates but by salaries actually paid. He found that from that time on they parted more and more; that the men who had been in the first third of their class in college were earning larger salaries than those in the second third, and those in the second third more than those in the third third; and that this divergence continued until they had been out about twenty years, when it accentuated itself very much, the better scholars rising and the lower scholars falling off relatively more.

The goods we produce are of a peculiar character. The machine, if you choose to call it so, that we place upon the market does not run very smoothly for the first hundred miles or so, by which I mean that it will not run as well as an inferior machine which has already been running for some time; but try it and let it run a while and then see how it compares. I think you will see that the difference is very considerable by that time.

Now, what is our process of manufacture? How do we try to make these queer and uncertain goods? We pursue a policy which is not quite wholly understood by those who do not know the constitution of the human mind. I was very much struck in reading Trevelyan's "History of England" at a remark he made about the medieval universities, and if I may I will simply read it because I do not want to massacre the words of a man like George Macaulay Trevelyan. He says:

"The chief study of the medieval universities was a peculiar school on logic. The great work of medieval and logic scholasticism was to train and subtilize the crude intellect of Europe. The intellectual progress of the middle ages is to be measured not by results in original thought, which was under an interdict, or at least in strict confinement, but by the skill with which men learned to handle their philosophic materials, though much of the subject-matter of their dispute seems to us as vain and nugatory as the much debated problem, 'How many angels can stand on the point of a needle?' The debt we owe to

these ancient choppers of logic is none the less great for being strictly inestimable."

There is a theory, at one time called "the Recapitulation Theory," which was that all in growing recapitulated the history of the human race; that the child started as a savage, then became a barbarian and then semi-civilized and so on. That theory has been naturally discarded because we know that infants are not savages.

Nevertheless, there is something true about it in the evolution of the mind of the race, just as the medieval universities trained men to think abstractly and to handle and deal with their material, to entertain abstract ideas, to think clearly and to develop a power of dealing with things which could not be perceived by the material senses, which was later of value when applied to useful results.

So it is true that the cultivation of the mind by the colleges is an attempt to make men think accurately, to discern between the essential and the accidental in phenomena, and to train the imagination to grasp things that cannot be felt or perceived by the material senses. That is the great object of college education. It is not merely to give knowledge. Knowledge vanishes away but wisdom, I take it, is after all a perception of the relative value of things.

I know some of you are saying to yourselves, "This is very well; but why not teach a man to think on subjects that he can apply, things that are useful as well as the things that are useless?" The answer is simply that dealing with the concrete does not lead to the knowledge of the abstract. The study of that which is directly applicable does not tend to give a grasp of things which are not perceived by the senses themselves. The mind that is directed toward the practical does not indulge in flights of imagination and thereby enlarge its scope.

I remember very well when I was in college and studying comparative anatomy and physiology with William James. He told me that he could pick out of the class the men who intended to be doctors because they spent their time studying human bones and thereby failed to grasp, as the rest of us did, the physiology, that is, the functions of animal life, which were, after all, the essential and valuable things in the course.

Let me put it in a different way. The real thing we want is not knowledge but resourcefulness. What I mean is that the art which creates things both great and small, is not the capacity for solving problems. That may seem a

curious statement, but the real art of life consists in finding out what is the question to be solved, and the person who can find out what the problem is to be solved is the man who really makes the contributions to life.

It is comparatively easy to train people to solve problems when they are started; but the man who can see a new problem and state it is the man who makes the real advance, and that is true in everything. You all know perfectly well that the young man you want in your business is the man who will perceive something that needs to be done and has not been done; and then the question of finding out how to do it is comparatively simple.

It happened to be my good fortune to meet some time ago two men who have made great contributions to medicine. One of them was Banting, whom I happened to meet at luncheon in Toronto, and I took the privilege of an older man and said, "Tell me how you found it"; and he told me how he made his discovery of insulin. It was a marvelous story. I wish I had time to tell it to you here. Shortly after that I happened to ask our Dr. Minot how he happened to get hold of the use of the liver treatment for pernicious anemia, which has practically abolished that disease, always fatal before but now banished. He told me how he did it. And in each case the great thing was finding out what the problem was. The solving it afterward took more time, but the really great thing was finding out what the problem was to be solved. That, we say, is resourcefulness; and that is what really we are attempting to impart.

How can resourcefulness be acquired? Do it by pumping into a man information? No, not at all. There is only one thing which will really train the human mind, and that is the voluntary use of the mind by the man himself. You may aid him, you may guide him, you may suggest to him, and, above all, you may inspire him; but the only thing that is worth having is that which he gets by his own exertions, and what he gets is proportionate to the effort he puts into it. It is the voluntary exercise of his own mind, and I care very little about what he exercises it upon.

In his study I noticed that Mr. Gifford paid no attention whatever to what subjects his men had studied, and I fancy the reason was that he did not consider that important. I myself made some studies twenty-five years ago about the relation between rank in college and rank in our law and medical schools, where I could easily get the figures, and I found just the same thing he found, that the men who had ranked high in college courses, with many exceptions, were on the average the men who ranked high in the law and

medical schools. I took also in that case the subjects they had studied, and I found that it made no difference. There was no perceptible difference between the men who had studied one subject or other; but there was a great superiority on the part of the men who really had done well in college and who had sharpened their minds by hard thought.

Given a certain voltage of intellectual power and, save in men who are unusually constituted, you can turn it into almost any channel and make it effective. The important thing is the degree of voltage, and that must come by making the men desire to educate themselves.

There was a theory that the way to make men educate themselves is to select the subject in which they were interested and study that. The trouble is that nine boys out of ten at that age have no real interest, and if you ask them what their interest is, they will select the thing which offers the least obstacle. In other words, their object, instead of being to cultivate their mind by effort, is to attempt to cultivate their mind with the least expenditure of energy.

Now, that is the wrong way. Any one who deals with young men who have an occupation realizes that almost any one will become interested in that which he really does earnestly. In other words, doing comes not from interest but interest comes from doing. That is, all of you are interested in the things you are doing. It is not because you were born with a natural interest for that particular kind of business. You know perfectly well you could have slid into something else; but as soon as you do a thing and try to do it well you become interested in doing it—you feel that it is worth while.

Such is the way we are trying to educate in our factory, and when I say "our" I mean the colleges of the United States are today aware of the fact that there has been a great deal too little energy put by students voluntarily into their work. We think that our product has improved, and, to revert to what I said in the beginning, it costs more. Try it and see whether it is worth the cost.

And, above all, let me ask you one thing: Help us to make a good product. When your son goes to college, do not be satisfied that he gets by or creeps through and obtains those other very substantial advantages which come from college; but feel that, when he goes, he goes there to get an education, and let him understand that it is the education you expect him to get.

The great trouble that we have is with parents who do not desire that their sons shall get an education. Why, then, do they send them to college? I will

not attempt to answer that question. You can answer it better than I can.

But the fact is that many parents do not seriously care that their boy gets an education. In other words, they do not seriously care that he should leave college with a well-trained and a self-trained brain which can be turned into fields of great utility for this country.

Now, I think any man is entitled to think that the particular thing in which he is engaged is the most important for the country, and therefore you will pardon me if I think our product of men is the most important for the future; and I bespeak your assistance in helping to hold up our hands in making that product, which will determine the fate of America in the next century, what it had better be.

QUESTIONS ON THE ADDRESS

1. Discuss Dr. Lowell's introduction.
2. Show how the speaker sustains the figure: "I am a manufacturer."
3. What do Mr. Gifford's statistics tend to prove?
4. What is the great object of college education?
5. Discuss this passage: "Dealing with the concrete does not lead to the knowledge of the abstract."
6. How does President Lowell explain the difference between knowledge and resourcefulness?
7. How is resourcefulness acquired?
8. What studies contribute more than others?
9. Explain: "Doing comes not from interest but interest comes from doing."
10. What charges does Dr. Lowell bring against parents?
11. What was the chief value of the medieval universities?
12. What was their chief defect?

TOPICS SUGGESTED BY THE ADDRESS

1. The College Brand.
2. The University Process.
3. The Medieval University.
4. The College Aim.
5. The Concrete and the Abstract.
6. Imagination in Business.
7. What's Wrong with the College?
8. Educating Parents.
9. Am I Interested in My Studies?

10. Does a College Education Pay.
11. The Lecture System.
12. Finding the Problem.
13. The City College or the Country College?
14. College Activities.
15. How to Cultivate Self-reliance.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. A study in capitalizing your observation. Make a list of interesting walks or trips you have taken, or things you have seen or experienced. In which topic can you interest an audience most? Prepare a three-minute talk. Consider only one phase of the original subject, restrict it to the narrowest limits consistent with clearness and interest. Choose the most attractive details, comparisons, or illustrations.

II. A study in reading and reflection. Give a five-minute talk on a subject of general interest. Write out brief notes on a subject with which you have some familiarity. Make an outline. Read for added information or inspiration. Select, reflect—fuse your new and old knowledge into original thought and statement. This talk should have the personal touch of the first one and should not disclose merely hasty and undigested reading.

III. Study the argument in a newspaper editorial, especially one that takes a positive stand on a debatable question. Give a short talk in which you state the writer's reasons and conclusions. Support these with added facts, illustration, or arguments from your experience or other reading, or refute the editor's logic by showing fallacies in his reasoning, incomplete or biased statement, or ignorance and misunderstanding of important details.

IV. Give a talk on a debatable question. Take a stand on some city, state, or national issue that permits of argument. Perhaps you recommend that the new schoolhouse be built on the corner of Washington and Elm streets, or that the strikers be approved, or that a bill in the Legislature be passed. State your case with vigor and persuasion and close with something like this: "So, Mr. Chairman, I move that this class go on record as approving a tax of five dollars on each student for the support of our college athletics." Anybody in the class may second the motion without rising. The instructor will say: "Are there any remarks?" Any student may now rise and say: "Mr. Chairman." If he is recognized by the chairman, he may go on to speak for or against the motion. It is desirable that a student be allowed to speak only once on a motion. Otherwise tiresome duels often result between members who are too eager to answer all objections. When the discussion is beginning to drag, the chairman should put the motion and say: "Those in favor signify by raising their right hands." Then, after the count, "Those opposed," etc. The motion should be clearly won or lost. The aim of the exercise is practice in impromptu speaking, which promotes confidence, fluency, and readiness.

V. The previous exercise may be varied by a forum discussion. Prepare carefully a talk of about seven minutes on some popular topic in business or science or politics or sociology. When you have given it, invite questions. Each student

should be limited to one question and should not argue with the speaker. The speaker should frankly say, "I don't know," if he does not, or show that the information is not available. Members of the class should not shout questions from their seats but should raise their hands. As each member is recognized by the Chair, he should rise and clearly and firmly ask his question and sit down. Do not prolong this exercise until the class is tired of it.

VI. The books listed below should not be considered as "best." They are interesting and helpful but not better than many others that would be given if space permitted For excellent comprehensive lists frequently revised and brought up to date, write for "A Reading List on Business Administration" (50 cents), The Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H., and for "Good Reading" (30 cents), The National Council of Teachers of English, 211 West 68th St., Chicago 21, Ill.

Use these books as sources of material for talks in class. Remember your aim is to entertain and inspire your classmates or society—not to recite a lesson. Discriminate in the selection of material. If you are discussing a man's life you will tell what he was rather than what he did How do his experiences throw light upon our own problems? How do they stir us to more purposeful endeavor? Give stimulating anecdotes and your own reflection upon his successes and failures. Drive home one or two points instead of relating a number of scattered impressions. His courage or energy or humanity may be your chief topic.

In discussing a novel do not try to tell the story in detail Your aim is to get your audience to read it, but if you reveal its incidents and surprises they will lose interest in it Summarize the plot in two or three sentences, show how the book interprets life, what the author thinks about feminism, or business, or education, or the conduct of the rich or the poor. It is excellent practice to read a passage or two by way of illustrating the author's skill, or of explaining his unusual ideas.

If you are reporting on a book of business, psychology, travel, or history, confine yourself to the chapters that seem most available for good talk. Keep your audience and your own background of interest and experience always in mind. Tell what you enjoyed.

BUSINESS

Beard, Miriam, "A History of the Business Man."
Black, Nelms, "How to Organize and Manage a Small Business."
De Armond, Fred, "Executive Thinking and Action."
Hacker, Louis M., "The Triumph of American Capitalism."

HANSEN, ALVIN H., "America's Role in the World Economy."
HARLOW AND BLACK, "Practical Public Relations."
HEILPERIN, MICHAEL A., "The Trade of Nations."
HEXNER, ERVIN, "International Cartels."
LEWISOHN, SAM A., "Human Leadership in Industry."
MAYNARD AND STEGEMERTEN, "Operation Analysis."
NOURSE, EDWIN G., "Price Making in a Democracy."
OSBORNE, DAVID R., "Salesmen for Tomorrow."
RUML, BEARDSLEY, "Tomorrow's Business."
SCHELL, ERWIN H., "The Technique of Executive Control."
SLICHTER, SUMNER H., "Modern Economic Society."

PUBLIC SPEAKING

ANDERSON, A., "Training the Speaking Voice."
AUER AND EWBANK, "Handbook for Discussion Leadership."
ESENWEIN, J. BERG, "How to Attract and Hold an Audience."
FAIRBANKS, GRANT, "Practical Voice Practice."
HANNAFORD, EARLE S., "Conference Leadership in Business and Industry."
HOFFMAN, WILLIAM G., "The Public Speaker's Scrapbook."
HOFFMAN AND ROGERS, "Effective Radio Speaking."
SARETT AND FOSTER, "The Basic Principles of Speech."
WINANS, J. A., "Public Speaking."

FICTION

BALZAC, HONORÉ, "The Country Doctor."
BROMFIELD, LOUIS, "The Green Bay Tree."
BUTLER, SAMUEL, "The Way of All Flesh."
CANFIELD, DOROTHY, "The Deepening Stream."
CATHER, WILLA, "Death Comes to the Archbishop."
DAVENPORT, MARCIA, "Valley of Decision."
DOSTOEVSKI, F. M., "Crime and Punishment."
DREISER, THEODORE, "The Financier."
FERBER, EDNA, "So Big."
GLASGOW, ELLEN, "Barren Ground."
HERGESHEIMER, JOSEPH, "Java Head."
HERRICK, ROBERT, "Chimes."
HOWELLS, W. D., "The Rise of Silas Lapham."
HUDSON, W. H., "The Purple Land."

KIPLING, RUDYARD, "Kim."
KOESTLER, ARTHUR, "Darkness at Noon."
LEWIS, SINCLAIR, "Babbitt."
NORRIS, FRANK, "The Pit."
RAWLINGS, MARJORIE KINNAN, "The Yearling."
SAROYAN, WILLIAM, "The Human Comedy."
STEINBECK, JOHN, "The Grapes of Wrath."
TARKINGTON, BOOTH, "The Turmoil."
TOLSTOI, LEO, "Anna Karenina."
WAKEMAN, FREDERICK, "The Hucksters."

BIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, HENRY, "The Education of Henry Adams."
BOK, EDWARD, "The Americanization of Edward Bok."
BOSWELL, JAMES, "Life of Samuel Johnson."
BOWEN, CATHERINE DRINKER, "Yankee from Olympus."
CELLINI, BENVENUTO, "The Life of Benvenuto Cellini."
DAVIS, J. J., "The Iron Puddler."
GARLAND, HAMLIN, "A Son of the Middle Border."
MAUGHAM, SOMERSET, "The Summing Up."
MITCHELL, EDWARD P., "Memoirs of an Editor."
PAINE, ALBERT B., "Life of Mark Twain."
PUPIN, MICHAEL, "From Immigrant to Inventor."
RIIS, JACOB, "The Making of an American."
SANDBURG, CARL, "Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years."
———, "Abraham Lincoln: The War Years."
SCHURZ, CARL, "Life of Henry Clay."
THAYER, W. R., "Theodore Roosevelt."
VALLERY-RADOT, "The Life of Pasteur."

PLAYS

GALSWORTHY, JOHN, "Loyalties," "The Skin Game," "The Pigeon."
HELLMAN, LILLIAN, "Little Foxes."
IBSEN, HENRIK, "An Enemy of the People," "The Wild Duck," "John Gabriel Borkman."
KAUFMAN AND CONNELLY, "To the Ladies," "Beggar on Horseback."
KENNEDY, CHARLES R., "The Servant in the House."
MOODY, WILLIAM VAUGHN, "The Great Divide."

O'NEILL, EUGENE G., "Marco Millions," "Strange Interlude," "Ah Wilderness."
OSBORN, PAUL, "A Bell for Adano."
PIRANDELLO, LUIGI, "Six Characters in Search of an Author," "As You Desire Me."
SHAW, GEORGE BERNARD, "Major Barbara," "Saint Joan," "Man and Superman," "Pygmalion."
SHERWOOD, ROBERT E., "The Petrified Forest," "Abe Lincoln in Illinois."
WILDER, THORNTON, "Our Town."
WILLIAMS, TENNESSEE, "Glass Menagerie."

POETRY

BROWNING, ROBERT, Dramatic Monologues.
DEUTSCH, BABETTE, "This Modern Poetry."
DREW, ELIZABETH, "Discovering Poetry."
FROST, ROBERT, "North of Boston."
KIPLING, RUDYARD, "Barrack Room Ballads."
LINDSAY, VACHEL, "The Chinese Nightingale and Other Poems."
MASTERS, EDGAR LEE, "Spoon River Anthology."
RITTENHOUSE, JESSIE B., "The Little Book of Modern Verse."
SANDBURG, CARL, "Smoke and Steel," "Collected Poems."
UNTERMEYER, LOUIS, "Poetry: Its Appreciation and Enjoyment."
WILKINSON, MARGUERITE, "New Voices."

ESSAYS

BELLOC, H., "On."
BENSON, A. C., "Along the Road."
CARLYLE, THOMAS, "Heroes and Hero-worship."
CHESTERTON, GILBERT K., "What's Wrong with the World."
DREISER, THEODORE, "Hey Rub-a-dub-dub and Other Papers."
EMERSON, RALPH WALDO, "Representative Men," "Essays."
HOLMES, OLVER WENDELL, "Autocrat of the Breakfast Table."
LEACOCK, STEPHEN, "Moonbeams from the Larger Lunacy."
THOREAU, HENRY D., "Walden."

LIBERALIZING BOOKS ON HISTORY AND PSYCHOLOGY

ARNOLD, THURMAN, "The Folklore of Capitalism."
BALDWIN, HANSON, "The Price of Power."
BEARD, CHARLES A., AND MARY R. BEARD, "The Rise of American Civilization."
BREASTED, JAMES HENRY, "The Conquest of Civilization."

CABOT, R. C., "What Men Live By."
CARREL, ALEXIS, "Man the Unknown."
DEWEY, JOHN, "Intelligence in the Modern World."
DIMNET, ERNEST, "The Art of Thinking."
DORSEY, GEORGE A., "Why We Behave Like Human Beings."
ELLIS, HAVELOCK, "The Dance of Life."
JEANS, SIR JAMES, "The Universe Around Us."
MARTIN, EVERETT DEAN, "The Behavior of Crowds."
OVERSTREET, H. A., "Influencing Human Behavior."
PARRINGTON, VERNON L., "Main Currents in American Thought."
QUINTANILLA, LUIS, "A Latin American Speaks."
ROBINSON, JAMES HARVEY, "The Mind in the Making."
TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J., "A Study of History."

HUMOR AND SATIRE

BENCHLEY, ROBERT C., "Benchley Beside Himself."
BISHOP, MORRIS G., "A Treasury of British Humor."
CERF, BENNETT A., "Try and Stop Me."
JOHNSON, EDGAR, "A Treasury of Satire."
LARDNER, RING, "You Know Me, Al."
PARKER, DOROTHY, "Dorothy Parker."
SMITH, H. ALLEN, "Life in a Putty Knife Factory."
THURBER, JAMES G., "Thurber Carnival."
WHITE, E. B., AND K. S. WHITE, "Sub-Treasury of American Humor."

TALKING AND WRITING

CHASE, STUART, "The Tyranny of Words."
CLAPP, J. M., "Talking Business."
FERNALD, JAMES C., "Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions."
HAYAKAWA, SAMUEL I., "Language in Action."
HOFFMAN AND DAVIS, "Write and Speak Better."
MAWSON, CHRISTOPHER, "Roget's Thesaurus of the English Language."
MENCKEN, HENRY L., "The American Language," and Supplements I and II.

SPEECH TOPICS

1. Cultural Lag
2. State of Mind
3. Volcanoes

4. The National Resources Committee
5. What Is a Classic?
6. The Assembly Line
7. Humanism
8. The Service Industries
9. Influence of the Movies
10. Inside Latin America
11. India's Industrial Development
12. Mississippi Pilot
13. Favorite American Heroes
14. New Designs in Architecture
15. One World
16. British Actors
17. Night Club
18. The Minor Leagues
19. How to Study
20. Contented Cows
21. Automobile Accessories
22. The Televised Fight
23. The Immigrant Looks at America
24. Nothing but the Truth
25. The Forgotten Man
26. The Forgotten Woman
27. The Black Sea
28. The Waitress
29. Tito
30. The Stock Market

CHAPTER X

HOW TO LISTEN

In a world of joiners we could stand a Society for the Promotion of Better Listening. Sometimes in the clatter of a social gathering you wonder if anybody listens. "Can you top this?" seems to be the party challenge. Interruptions, long-windedness, overeagerness for attention, victory, and applause make a childish uproar instead of pleasant civilized banter or discussion. Even the round tables on the air are often ruined by this immature exhibitionism and lack of restraint. You hear weak, shallow, insecure speakers who can't listen politely, patiently, thoughtfully, but must break into another's talk with rude and ill-considered objections, rebuttals, or expostulations.

Two-point Program. Familiar as this criticism is, a natural egotism often frustrates the desire for poise. Everyone may memorize with profit this shrewd advice by Disraeli:

> The art of conversation consists of the exercise of two fine qualities. You must originate and you must sympathize: you must possess at the same time the habit of communicating and the habit of listening. The union is rather rare but irresistible.

Aside from its importance in discussions and conferences, think how significant this habit becomes in the general run of business. Management needs good listeners—executives who learn to understand employees and win their confidence by thoughtful, sympathetic listening.

It is only by listening carefully that one can search a mind for hidden motives, for inarticulate resentments, for the reasons behind the reasons. Obsessions cannot be argued away. They will not be put off with facts and figures, proof that the individual is wrong. An employee is what he is, a complex of many, sometimes contradictory, forces.

The executive may need to listen, as does the psychiatrist, for something not yet disclosed, a sickness of mind or body that can be helped only when sufficient clues and symptoms are discovered. "He won't listen to me" is a common complaint, which we often regard as trivial or unjustified, but behind it is more than disappointment that a request has been denied. It is a feeling that the listener has been listening only superficially, without the will to sympathize and understand. Of course we have the expression of intellectual contempt, "He did not suffer fools gladly," but it is hardly a motto to put on the executive's desk.

Just listening politely and passively isn't enough. Some listeners appear dumb. They make no response in looks or speech. They actually embarrass a speaker. Whether in conversation or in public speaking communication is a two-way process in which the audience gives as well as receives.

What the Listener Should Give. It is true, of course, that the public speaker must earn attention, that he should be aware of the common indifference to things and ideas not clearly of present interest to his listeners. His responsibility is to create that interest, but the listeners owe him a fair hearing. They should not appear bored, prejudiced, or hypercritical. Least of all, as students, should they withdraw into a vanity of ignorance and say, "I don't know anything about this matter and care less." Cooperative, creative listening and questioning will produce something of value from every talk. When the ideas themselves are not productive, the personality of the speaker, his skill or incompetence, will give a good listener many clues on the art of communication.

The Whole Man Speaks. He will notice, for instance, how often character, manners, and words seem to speak contradictory languages. Why is it that a speech that sounds good on the air may give an unfavorable impression to the audience in the studio? Why does a speech that seems excellent to the hearers in the hall sound dull to the invisible audience? Why does a listener sometimes say, "Nice chap. Too bad he isn't a better speaker," or "The fellow's a good speaker, knows his stuff, but I don't like him."

Is the good speaker mostly a good man, a good mind, a good voice, or a good "front"? Can one be a successful speaker without having all these values? Is there any way of measuring them? At any rate, the whole man is involved in every speech, and this fact may be more important to a discriminating listener than what is said.

Taking Notes. In the classroom intelligent listening pays. Instructors, however, often complain that students don't know how to take notes. Well, instructors don't either. At teachers' conventions you will see the teachers furiously writing in thick notebooks, trying to take down everything the speaker says, and disconcerting him no end. I have actually heard speakers beg these conscientious teachers to stop writing, look up, and listen.

What to Put Down. You can't put down everything. Don't write so busily that you can't pay close attention to what the speaker is saying. You know that he has some sort of progressive arrangement, and you soon discover whether it is simple or involved.

The lecturer's introductory remarks may be obvious enough to make note taking unnecessary. He prepares you, perhaps, for his major point with a pause, a change of pitch, or a plain statement. Does this point need clarifying to you? Does it need something to make the idea more vivid or significant? You listen for the amplifying remarks. They may consist of definition, proof, comparison or contrast, cause and effect, or some incident that gives conviction to the main proposition.

How much of all this should go into your notebook? Perhaps nothing. Your recording of the principal point may be all you need. On the other hand, one or more of the various items the speaker presented to give the thought force or richer meaning may be worth remembering for future use. How much writing should this require? Very little. Your chief business is to listen, to ponder, to ask questions silently. You can't do this if you are writing fast and trying to keep up with the speaker.

Suppose you had to give a talk on this lecture. You would depend on your memory for almost everything, and that would fail you unless you were listening with undivided attention. So put down only a few key

words. An arresting phrase may be important because it gives you the cue for extended discussion. Continue to listen for the three or four main headings, jotting them down carefully and adding only what you need for their fuller comprehension. Add questions that you still wish cleared up. Pay special attention to closing remarks. They may include a summary that will help you to make a clearer outline of the whole talk.

The Follow-up. In business everything seems to need a follow-up, and that is true of note taking. If you don't look at those notes again until you wish to use them for a test or examination, how much help will they give you? Weeks have passed and many other things have demanded your attention. What can your few notes do to bring back a reasonable measure of freshness and detail to something you've practically forgotten?

Of course, if the lecturer has merely told you what you can find in your textbook, you can afford to forget your notes entirely. In any other case, however, you should review those notes as soon as you have a free period. Reflect upon them—memory needs repetition—and add useful details that you recall from the lecture. Put down comment and question of your own. A few minutes of this kind of work will relieve you of most of the foolish "cramming" that passes for study. It trains you to ask the right questions, to distinguish the essential from the nonessential, to go coolly to examinations because you know what counts and what doesn't.

Listening to Talks by Classmates. When listening to talks by classmates you are engaged in critical evaluation rather than the mere assimilation of factual material, and this sort of exercise does more to improve your creative thought and expression. It may require a bit of system. What are you looking for? What should you analyze and criticize? You may classify your comments under four main heads such as thought, language, voice, and bearing, or you may simply follow the speaker, noting significant details that reveal his present state of competence or incompetence.

Attention to Opening Remarks. You know that the first few sen-

tences suggest more than they say. They tempt you to make judgment on the whole speech. You are liable to say, "This is going to be good," or "Sounds as though it will be dull." In a minute you will find answers to questions like these: Is the speaker uneasy or embarrassed in starting? Does he mount the platform comfortably, pause for a moment to take a good breath, look around and collect attention? Is his first sentence interesting yet natural? Does he indicate a good reason for speaking upon the topic, or is this just a digest of another magazine article selected at random with no regard for the basic "wants" of his audience? Does the speaker begin by a reference to other talks on the same subject or by a news item that gives his topic special point? Does he appear confident, interested, and enjoying the opportunity to discuss his subject, or does he sound like slave labor drudging through a disagreeable required assignment?

Hearing the Speaker's Tune. Presently you note the student's characteristic "tune," his volume, pitch, inflection, timing, pause, quality of tone. Is it a pleasant melody or a gruff monotone? Shut your eyes for a moment and imagine you are listening to a radio speaker. Is there enough warmth, zest, conversational attack, to keep you from turning to another station?

Speech Manners. Does the speaker lack maturity in language? Many college students are slow in acquiring a vocabulary that is adequate for public speaking. They don't read beyond their textbooks and they don't discuss with others what they read. They confine their talk to baseball, football, girls, fraternities, college gossip and politics, with little thought about the more general problems that interest audiences. College training is expected to teach students how to think. How to think about what and how to say it is perhaps too large an order.

Simple, correct language is always in good taste, but careless, sloppy articulation offends all ears. The listener may give up after a succession of *gotta's, gonna's, gimme's,* or *jis', lib'ry, reco'nize.* "Too bad," he concludes, "he sounds illiterate."

The Speech Plan. But the serious critic doesn't give up so soon. The speaker may have a good head and refreshing self-reliance in spite of

crudities. Has he organized his material with intelligence and care? Is he revealing it in a clear, orderly, progressive sequence? Has he adequate proof and illustrations for his principal points? Does he, on the contrary, talk too long on obvious matters, lose audience interest by prolix, rambling discussion punctuated by *uh's, well's,* and *why's?*

Choice of Words. Our language is full of fossil fancy phrases that can't always be avoided, but the alert, somewhat sophisticated speaker is aware of them and does not clutter his speech with echo, imitative, secondhand jargon. I listened to several political conventions recently and my ears are still ringing with *that great American, splendid, stalwart, distinguished, humble, courageous,* and other dreary repetitions that must have wearied the delegates as much as the heat. The student may not be so glib with political clichés but he is equally tiresome with *each and every, man, woman, and child, the man in the street, at the psychological moment, pure and simple, to all intents and purposes, as I said before, like I said, we are fortunate in having with us today,* and other characterless stuff that shows more interest in sound than in sense.

From Semantics. There is nothing new in the idea that words are only signs and symbols for things and meanings. We know that they only roughly define or explain and that they sometimes have several meanings. We have little trouble with relatively concrete and specific words like *chair, bicycle, tomato, stand, sit, theater,* etc. But the abstract words, like *virtue, honesty, cowardice, democracy, justice, free enterprise,* and so on, may give us a world of trouble. These are blanket terms that include ideas that no two persons may be agreed upon. "What is Truth?" Pilate asked a long time ago, although no one has called him the founder of semantics. He probably was amused at the uproar of the Jerusalem populace. What they called truth, he probably called superstition, or religious bigotry, or stupid patriotism. What the Roman soldiers called treason, he may have called courage, stubbornness, fanaticism, or foolish idealism. What you call virtue, another may call prudery; what you call cowardice may be regarded as prudence; what you term honesty another may call narrow-mindedness. Everyone defines these abstractions in terms of his own limited experience, reading, and insight.

We boil at the misuse the Russians make of the word *democracy.* They call us *exploiters* and *imperialists.* We talk about their *regimentation* and *slave labor camps.* We label one another as *isolationist, New Dealer, radical, reactionary, wing flapper, do-gooder.*

The lesson of semantics is simply that you must not be deceived by words and names. Look for the facts. In a world of words we often mistake the word for the thing itself, and there are plenty of politicians and propagandists who deliberately drape beautiful words over ugly things to keep us from examining these things more closely. Others use smear words, loaded words, charged words to stir up our emotions and obscure our sense.

Then there is the technique of evasive language instead of the direct and accurate. During the war we could get a laugh out of the stereotyped communiqué, "Our forces withdrew (or retired) to previously prepared positions." That was breaking the news gently and made it almost comforting. But as we recognized it for what it was, we wondered whether the army was badly defeated or only driven back a few miles.

Study the speaker's language. Is he making a serious attempt to define, limit, and make ideas and things more specific, or does he prefer blanket terms that may mean something or nothing and spare him the trouble of getting necessary facts and details.

Propaganda. Everybody is likely, at some time or other, to give a biased presentation, whether he intends to or not. Propaganda may contain essential truth—the original meaning of the word was simply "information" or "education"—but it is usually a distorted version of fact; certain things are magnified to suit the purpose of the speaker, others are not mentioned or are condemned if they are unfavorable in securing the desired effect. We believe, say the psychologists, what we like to believe, what promotes our own comfort, privilege, or interest, and are rather quick to oppose anything that seems to threaten them. At any rate, the listener will improve his own objectivity by considering the degree of thoughtful, objective analysis revealed by the speaker.

Professor Donald M. Brieland, in a speech to the Women's Institute of Omaha, summarizes clearly this part of the listener's responsibility:

> It is to the listener that one must look for better language habits, because the tendencies of public speakers will change only as audiences build up resistance to their glib pigeonholing techniques. If you are willing to be nourished on a diet made up of stereotypes and abstractions that is exactly what you will be served. Its nutritional value is not high enough to provide much growth. It is only when you begin asking searching questions that aim at precise definitions of popular oratorical jargon that your listening will become critical. This is the first step toward its becoming creative.

Clues in the Conclusion. Not every talk should have a formal or marked conclusion. The end of a list of directions, the close of a narrative, the concluding of a few informal remarks, require no summary, no exhortation, no advice or recommendation. But there are many occasions when some such follow-up is expected. If a speech is long and full of perplexing and contradictory details, the audience may desire a quick review, a nutshell summary, and an answer to "So what?" Perhaps a relevant story, quotation, or question will best point up the vital meaning of the talk.

Listen, then, to the final words. Has the student given any thought to them? Did his voice trail off as if they were unimportant? Has he left obvious and essential questions unanswered or unconsidered? Has he shown at last that he doesn't understand a few simple principles of logic and persuasion?

What's Good in the Talk? It is easier to find fault than to give praise, especially in the case of young and inexperienced speakers. You will sharpen your skill in accurate appraisal if you also look for what is promising. You know that talks are often interesting in spite of errors, blunders, details of poor presentation. Why is that? Was it the novelty or timeliness of the subject? Was it the heartiness or good humor of the speaker? Was he giving an unpopular point of view with sturdy good sense? Was it his positive, eager, self-reliant manner as compared with other students' negative monotony?

Transcending Techniques. In other words, do character and personality sometimes produce successful talks in spite of noticeable violations of conventional standards? Another question that troubles us with its implied contradictions is: why do some speakers appear to give better talks when they are unprepared? Consider this answer: in planning and preparation students often put themselves into a strait jacket of language and structure. They don't intend to memorize, but their several extemporaneous rehearsals have made too precise a pattern, one they are tempted to follow too closely on the platform. Studying the notes silently, without practicing aloud, may serve better. Three or four words, the main points, may be framework enough to support speakers without entangling them.

Your Report. If you must write a report, an analysis, of a student's talk, you may prefer one of those systematic score sheets which are given to judges at speech contests. You could write a number, or *excellent, good, fair, poor* after such items as *subject, motivation, preparation, illustrations, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, enunciation, voice quality, force, pitch, inflection, rate, pause, posture, bearing,* and *gesture.* But it wouldn't do you much good or the student you appraise. It is surprising how barren such a report can be. The words are all too vague and impersonal. It is another question of semantics. What do you mean by *excellent, good, fair, poor,* and the rest of the abstractions on the list? They don't suggest anything to the student, who would like a real, specific picture or "profile" of his speech condition.

Examine, for a moment, this anonymous report handed in by a student. It is not very searching or detailed, but you will probably agree that it is more interesting and useful to the student who got it than a grade sheet.

I suffered with you when you began your talk by telling us you had the same subject as the student who spoke before you, and much the same material. But it was the best thing that could have happened to you. You didn't quit and you had to give up the memorized stuff you always gave us in spite of the fact that we always caught you at it.

For the first time you really looked at us instead of past us or out the

window. Because you had to make up a new speech you actually talked to us. You referred several times to Perry's speech and were able to add a few things he overlooked. And where did you get that wonderful story to wind up with? It had everybody gasping with suspense.

Your vocabulary and diction have always been good. We could see that you were quite a reader. But your voice has been too soft and your rate of speaking too hurried. You looked like a sleepwalker just trying to unload something and get away from there.

But today something hit you and woke you out of that trance. You naturally floundered around some to get your bearings, but you kept awake and seemed to enjoy yourself.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Write one report every week of the term, each time on a different student in the class These comments will be unsigned, leaving you free to make frank, informal, sympathetic evaluations Each criticism should be about a page in length and should include, at least in your later reports, some helpful advice. Attach a card to your report or enclose it in another sheet of paper with your name on it so that the instructor may give you credit for the assignment. He will then pass it along to the student criticized.

II. Make an oral report on a radio speech.

III. Write a report on the language of a speaker—his articulation, pronunciation, and choice of words

IV. Listen carefully to the voice of a student speaker and give an oral report to the class on the nature of his timing, force, pitch, inflection, and quality of voice

V. Discuss the structure of a student's talk Comment on the beginning, list the principal points, speak of the conclusion, and mention matters you think were neglected or too little considered in the talk

VI. Give a talk on the degree of response a student speaker got from his classmates To what motive, if any, did he appeal? Give illustrations from his style and procedure to show why he was or was not a good two-way speaker.

TOPICS FOR TALKS

1. Where I Fought the War
2. The Occupation of Germany
3. Road Building
4. Inheritance Taxes
5. Unemployment Insurance
6. The Attention Value of Color
7. The Cattle Industry
8. Uses of Copper
9. Seasonal Worker
10. Our National Parks
11. The St. Lawrence Waterway
12. Industrialization of the Far East
13. Ghost Towns
14. The Grange
15. Millionaire Oilman
16. Riches in the Southwest

17. Waikiki
18. The Navajos
19. An Impressive Movie
20. The Flow of Capital
21. Postwar France
22. Hitchhiking
23. More on Atomic Fission
24. Communist Techniques
25. Albert Einstein
26. Junior Colleges
27. The Black Sea
28. Markdown
29. Guerrilla
30. Chinaman's Chance

CHAPTER XI

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

The businessman has for some time been trying to apply the findings of psychology to salesmanship, advertising, and scientific management. The study of human behavior is, of course, as old as man himself. But it is only recently that systematic observation and experiment have been able to deduce principles and laws of association, habit, attention, repetition, suggestion, memory, fatigue, etc. Psychology has confirmed much that has been taught for centuries about composition, rhetoric, and oratory. It gives this knowledge fresh significance, however, by classifying it under general tendencies of action and reaction. Psychology also shows us that a "knowledge of human nature," "common sense," is often only common ignorance.

The Psychological Attitude. The psychologists tell us that we must first get the psychological attitude toward every piece of work we are to perform; that is, get the habit of analyzing every whole into its parts, of studying the various operations in their details. It is this attitude which has yielded increased efficiency not only in certain industrial lines but in practical speech problems.

Analysis. The trained salesman, for example, does not talk on and on at random. He has analyzed his problem into several steps, which he coordinates and subordinates into an effective canvass. He considers the preapproach, the approach, the choice and arrangement of arguments, the appeal, and the conclusion. The advertiser can find even more efficient methods because his work is in writing or in pictures. He can examine it longer and more accurately and check the results more definitely. He has already an exceedingly valuable body of knowledge as to the relative merits of the several sizes of type, of amounts of space,

of colors, of positions, of "reason why" and appeal copy, of frequency, repetition, etc.

The salesman, the advertiser, the teacher, and the public speaker have much in common. The teachers of oratory in ancient Greece and Rome were strenuous analysts. They divided a speech into these parts: invention, preparation, exordium (introduction), proposition, partition, proof, refutation, peroration (conclusion). Cicero liked to compare the divisions of a speech to the porch, corridor, and rooms of a house. We have discovered nothing new in this phase of the study but have condensed and simplified the outline to make it more adaptable to several types of speeches not practiced by the ancients.

Application. Scientific management has discovered after many costly mistakes that the analysis of the job is only a part of the problem. The next and equally important step is to apply laws of psychology to the workers affected. How can the men be made to understand, to believe, and to cooperate in the new plans? The audience has much the same relation to the speaker and his subject. It is not enough that a talk be logical. It must also be psychological.

Argument Not Enough. One of the most important contributions of psychology is the rediscovery that man is not the deliberative, reasoning creature we usually assume him to be. Argument affects all of us more or less, but it can hardly be called the determining factor of conduct. We are swayed chiefly by desire, prejudice, emotion, suggestion, imitation. We seek comfort, pleasure, satisfaction. We sacrifice the greater distant good for the smaller immediate good. The pictures, images, that come to us most vividly are likely to have the greatest influence. The fact is, thinking is hard work even for the best-trained minds. We take short cuts or slip back into the old familiar routine. It requires too much effort to see clearly the relative values of contending reasons, to follow the lines of cause and effect, to make a decisive choice of alternatives, to find ways and means, and to follow up conclusions with energetic action.

To Rationalize. Psychology has given us a new and popular word to stigmatize our self-deception. When a man is fooling himself with

plausible reasons, when he is trying to justify himself in a course of action, when he is salving his conscience or his intelligence, we say he is *rationalizing;* that is, trying to make the irrational look rational. He gives us reasons that look good enough to himself, while the real reasons lie concealed deep in his subconscious mind.

We believe what we wish to believe, and we do what we desire as long as it is safe and convenient. We "fix up" the reasons later. The various codes, moral, religious, political, and business, are largely taboos to keep these motivating and energizing desires from spilling over into action that may be injurious to ourselves or others. Duty implies restraint, discipline, and conflict with something we prefer. It is a disagreeable word, and the public speaker can make little headway with it. He meets too much resistance. He should advocate a proposed action by an appeal to the feelings. He will not argue or insist so much as he will show the proposal attractively, temptingly, until the audience actively desires it. Then duty and desire embrace and are identical; and the will, which is not a separate disciplined faculty reserved for special effort but the whole being integrated by intense desire, will find the way.

All this was well known long before the old Roman, Ovid, said, "We are slow to believe that which if believed would hurt our feelings." The Greeks condemned their own orators for playing upon the passions of audiences. But they got their cues perhaps from the august Plato himself, who, in the "Phaedrus," puts these words into the mouth of Socrates:

> Oratory is the art of enchanting the soul, and therefore he who would be an orator has to learn the differences of human souls—they are so many and of such a nature, and from them come the differences between man and man. Having proceeded thus far in his analysis, he will next divide speeches into their different classes: "Such and such persons," he will say, "are affected by this or that kind of speech in this way or that way," and he will tell you why. The pupil must have a good theoretical notion of them first, and then he must have experience of them in actual life, and be able to follow them with all his senses about him, or he will never get beyond the precepts of his masters. But when he understands what persons are persuaded by what argu-

ments, and sees the person about whom he was speaking in the abstract actually before him, and knows that it is he, and can say to himself, "This is the man or this is the character who ought to have a certain argument applied to him in order to convince him of a certain opinion;"—he who knows all this, and knows also when he should speak and when he should refrain, and when he should use pithy sayings, pathetic appeals, sensational effects, and all the other modes of speech which he has learned—when, I say, he knows the times and seasons of all these things, then, and not till then, he is a perfect master of his art.[1]

Chesterfield puts this a little more directly to our modern ears in a letter to his son:

Wherever you would persuade or prevail, address yourself to the passions; it is by them that mankind is to be taken. Caesar bade his soldiers, at the battle of Pharsalia, aim at the faces of Pompey's men; they did so, and prevailed. I bid you strike at the passions; and if you do, you too will prevail. If you can once engage people's pride, love, pity, ambition (or whichever is their prevailing passion), you need not fear what their reason can do against you.

And in another letter:

Gain the heart, or you gain nothing; the eyes and the ears are the only roads to the heart. Merit and knowledge will not gain hearts, though they will secure them when gained.

All good salesmanship appeals first to the heart. It makes us want things and then clinches the order with the easy business of showing that the desire is not inconsistent with intelligence. I may think, for instance, that I ought to have the "Encyclopedia Britannica" as a useful tool of education. But the cost seems prohibitive just now, and common sense urges me to put off the purchase. This is the ordinary situation a salesman confronts. He does not overcome it by arguing about the price, but by filling my mind with delightful pictures of pleasant evenings spent upon fascinating courses of reading. I see my family transformed by the vocational, cultural, and altogether civilizing benefits

[1] Quoted from Lane Cooper, "Theories of Style."

of these splendid volumes. It does not require much ingenuity to satisfy me now that I can afford them. For a few cents a day I make an investment that will yield immediate and permanent dividends of great profit.

An automobile may seem like an impossible extravagance. But when the salesman draws his specific and vivid pictures of the pleasures and possibilities of the car, the prospective buyer looks for reasons that will make the apparent extravagance defensible and satisfactory conduct. The health of the family will be greatly improved. What was formerly paid the doctor can now be paid on the car. Then, too, the buyer can use it in his business. Not very often just now, perhaps, but more as time goes on. The car will no doubt pay for itself.

Nonrational Belief. No public speaker can afford to overlook the deeper implications of rationalization. There are many things in the life of every person that cannot be argued away. They can only be overcome gradually through favorable and repeated suggestion. We are, says the psychologist, bundles of complexes (a fancy word for feelings), laughable and tragic results of forces that shaped us from the cradle and about which we had little or nothing to say. James Harvey Robinson, in "The Mind in the Making," explains this very compactly and clearly:

> I remember years ago attending a public dinner to which the Governor of the state was bidden. The chairman explained that His Excellency could not be present for certain "good" reasons; what the "real" reasons were the presiding officer said he would leave us to conjecture. This distinction between "good" and "real" reasons is one of the most clarifying and essential in the whole realm of thought. We can readily give what seem to us "good" reasons for being a Catholic or a Mason, a Republican or a Democrat, an adherent or opponent of the League of Nations. But the "real" reasons are usually on quite a different plane. Of course the importance of this distinction is popularly, if somewhat obscurely, recognized. The Baptist missionary is ready enough to see that the Buddhist is not such because his doctrines would bear careful inspection, but because he happened to be born in a Buddhist family in Tokio. But it would be treason to his faith to acknowledge that his own partiality for certain doctrines is due to the fact that his mother was a member of the First Baptist Church of Oak Ridge. A savage can give all sorts of

reasons for his belief that it is dangerous to step on a man's shadow, and a newspaper editor can advance plenty of arguments against the Bolsheviki. But neither of them may realize why he happens to be defending his particular opinion.

The real reasons for our beliefs are concealed from ourselves as well as from others. As we grow up we simply adopt the ideas presented to us in regard to such matters as religion, family relations, property, business, our country and the state. We unconsciously absorb them from our environment. They are persistently whispered in our ear by the group in which we happen to live. Moreover, as Mr. Trotter has pointed out, these judgments, being the product of suggestion and not of reasoning, have the quality of perfect obviousness, so that to question them . . . "is to the believer to carry skepticism to an insane degree, and (it) will be met by contempt, disapproval, or condemnation, according to the nature of the belief in question. When, therefore, we find ourselves entertaining an opinion about the basis of which there is a quality of feeling which tells us that to inquire about it would be absurd, obviously unnecessary, unprofitable, undesirable, bad form, or wicked, we may know that the opinion is a non-rational one, and probably, therefore, founded upon inadequate evidence."

Suggestion. Example, repetition, affirmation, insinuation, are more powerful, move more people, than argument. Advertisers make practical and extended use of the law of suggestion, which is based upon a fundamental characteristic of man—imitation. Society is held together by that cement. We imitate first one person or group, then another. A favorable suggestion induces imitation. It implies that something is being thought or done by someone else in whom we have confidence, and we have an active tendency to do likewise. Whether the tendency or idea will be translated into action depends upon the force of the suggestion and the ideas that conflict with it. Walter Dill Scott in "Influencing Men in Business" defines the law as follows:

> Every idea of an action will result in that action unless hindered by an impeding idea or physical impediment.

The most extreme illustration is that of hypnotism. In the hypnotic state the subject will obey the most absurd or difficult commands un-

less physically hindered. He will tell many things forgotten by his conscious mind but stored deep down in the subconscious. Pathologists effect cures through vivid constructive suggestions to the patient while he is in a hypnotic or semihypnotic condition. The fully conscious mind differs only in degree, in the number of inhibitions or obstructions it puts in the way of transforming suggestions into action.

Impulses come from within, but suggestion always comes from without. It is exerted by an external stimulus that may take the form of a word or a picture, of motion, music, or some other idea that comes through the senses. Ideas are active, dynamic, and move us to immediate action in the absence of competing ideas.

Suggestion dispenses with argument, comparison, and criticism. An advertisement composed of a picture and five or six words may be so full of suggestion that it will get more action than a page of "reason-why copy." And what is equally important, it is sure to be read. Much, of course, depends upon the nature of the reader and the goods. Expensive articles need more argument.

Varying Force of Suggestion. There are usually competing ideas of more or less weight calling for the attention of the individual, and psychology has demonstrated that a suggestion has force according to its recency, frequency, and vividness. Other things being equal, the last suggestion will be the most effective. Repetition is perhaps the most powerful single agent. It takes time for most suggestions to accumulate force. An advertisement repeated nine times in a magazine has far more than ten times the effect of a single advertisement. The vividness of picture, color, or phrase reproduces a corresponding image in the mind and helps to drive out competing or conflicting images.

Direct or Indirect Suggestion. Notice that a command often suggests its opposite and is for that reason not so effective as might be expected. "Do it now," "Order at once," "Shop at Smith's," "Sign here," have a noticeable pull, but as we become sophisticated, become used to these tricks, we resent them. They are too direct and blunt. We like to feel that we are our own masters. We steel ourselves against a command,

but are glad to take a hint because we think we are making up our own minds. The skillful advertiser, therefore, gives us indirect suggestion: "Until November 1," "We have a few more left," "Men of discrimination wear," "The skilled mechanic uses B and X tools."

Belief in Suggestion. Scott gives another attribute of suggestion in this general law: "Every idea, concept or conclusion which enters the mind is held as true unless hindered by some contradictory idea." We are inclined to believe what we hear. The newspapers give us daily evidence of the immense credulity and gullibility of mankind.

Confidence through Authority. The problem of the speaker is to make conditions that will give the greatest force to suggestion. This means, first of all, getting the confidence of the audience. When the barriers of suspicion or doubt are removed, suggestion is comparatively free and unchallenged. Authority, prestige, is certainly a great factor in securing confidence. The child is highly suggestible before his parents or teacher. Adults respond almost as readily to the suggestions of experts, persons of proved efficiency in any field. The president of the railroad, the judge, the well-known senator or explorer has a tremendous advantage to begin with. He speaks with authority.

Personality. An unknown speaker wins confidence by suggesting sincerity, modesty, and poise. His deportment on the platform and his first few words are important. Inscrutability is often remarkably effective. An impassive face frequently suggests reserve, hidden power, something "up the sleeve." William the Silent, Grant, Coolidge, and others of known taciturnity have usually caught the public's imagination.

A shrewd and widely experienced student of political speakers says in *The Saturday Evening Post* of Feb. 3, 1923:

> I believe that next to this mistake (that of believing the voter can be "stockyard delivered") the defeated candidate, all other things being equal, may look for the cause of defeat to his own personal conduct when on exhibition before his fellows. It takes a genius to maintain naturalness, particularly when a false step of artificiality may be fatal. It takes a genius to keep the

appearance of his personality sincere and not too vehement, vigorous, and sweaty on the one hand or too colorless and feeble and timid and gentle and modest on the other.

The average judgment of the American voter as to the sincerity of a man is keen. He will be much more easily deceived about a man's doctrine than about the man himself. Defeated candidates will always do well to ask themselves whether they have made the slip known as the phony play.

Many a defeated candidate can ascribe a large part of his failure to neglect of the following principle: Once in a dog's age a man in politics can pretend to be more of a fellow than he is and pass for a while, but beware of trying to make pretenses to be less of a man than you are.

I remember a candidate who went into a district of workingmen to make a final speech in a state campaign. He believed it would endear him to his audience if he appeared to be a democratic type of man. He carefully avoided wearing tall hat, frock coat or cutaway. He dressed himself in a slouchy suit and took a corncob pipe with him. He talked about "people like us." It was fatal!

In the first place, men and women have no wish that their leaders shall be like them. They want leaders to be different and better. There was no respect shown them by appearing in an old tweed suit. It was the undemocratic tall hat which would have shown the proper respect. As for the corncob pipe, it was believed, though unjustly, to be a 100 per cent affectation, and that was the final straw! In politics, as in all other lanes of life, pretense is the name of the stone on which the toes of any ambition for popular success are most painfully stubbed.

Attention. Confidence alone will not take the speaker very far. His is a never ending fight for attention. The involuntary attention that one may get by a skillful beginning must be converted into sustained, voluntary attention—conscious, attending concentration. This means inducing a state of mind in which distracting and conflicting ideas are thrust into the background or almost entirely eliminated. Getting this absorption on the part of an audience is much easier than it is on the part of the individual.

The "Psychological Crowd." This may be illustrated by a brief reference to what is called "crowd psychology." The crowd of people

one joins on a Saturday afternoon in the shopping district is heterogeneous. The individuals are strangers to one another, and each is absorbed in his own affairs. It would become a homogeneous or psychological crowd if a fire suddenly broke out, or if a robbery or murder were publicly committed and the attention of all were united upon a common interest. Common indignation at the murder would weld the crowd into a unit. Crowds of this sort are highly suggestible. The propriety, responsibility, and independence of the individual are sometimes wholly absorbed by the mass.

The extreme form of the crowd is a mob. The mob has only one mind and that is an unreasoning one. It is swayed wholly by pictures, images, emotion. If it could reason it would dissolve. If a leader leaps out before it with confidence, it will follow him implicitly. If commanded, it will lynch, burn, or destroy. Sane counsel will also prevail. At the news of Lincoln's assassination a sorrowful, but indignant and ominous crowd gathered around the New York Custom House. James A. Garfield stepped out on the balcony and almost instantly restored their sense of order and responsibility. There was eloquent suggestion of confidence and serenity in these few words:

> Clouds and darkness are around him; his pavilion is dark waters and thick clouds; justice and judgment are the establishment of his throne; mercy and truth shall go before his face. Fellow citizens, God reigns and the government at Washington still lives!

Many stories are told of the suggestibility of the mobs of Paris during the French Revolution. A leader would suggest the death of some supposed aristocrat. The crowd would rush furiously upon its victim with a common desire to tear him limb from limb. Sometimes a witticism would divert them, or a sudden bold and genial word of defense would set them dancing madly about the victim and embracing him with every sign of devoted affection.

Common Action Transforms Audience. This seems to have little connection with the quiet, businesslike audience before the speaker, but the difference is again only one of degree. The same kind of absorp-

tion, not so sensational, to be sure, or so extreme, is possible here with a corresponding availability for suggestion. How can this group be saturated with a common interest, thought, or atmosphere? How can you get a fixation, an intensification, of attention? Several devices have been thoroughly exploited for centuries. They consist chiefly in having the crowd do something in common.

Religious revivals furnish the most notable examples. The evangelist leads his audience in vigorous singing. He tries to get everyone to take part, to abandon himself to the common emotional state. A common ritual in which all stand up at the same time, sit down at the same time, and pray together helps to induce the necessary identity of feeling. A mass meeting of students before a football game begins with cheers. A meeting of striking workmen requires little of this supplementary stimulation. There is already a common and intense mood.

Sense of Expectancy. Politicians have not been slow to take a hint from the "leading lady." Her entrance is delayed by the dramatist until several or most of the actors have appeared and spoken lines calculated to focus interest upon her. She appears at the "psychological moment." The principal candidate for election is late at every "rally," not only because he has to speak at so many other places first, but because the minor speakers must have time to whip the audience into a common enthusiasm and expectancy for the great man.

Ceremony. Ceremony plays a big part in making audiences suggestible. The trappings and procedure of the courtroom are intended to impress the prisoner and the spectators with the majesty of the law. Meager appointments and casual, hurried, unimaginative procedure greatly reduce the influence of many of the smaller courts. Americans have been accused of recklessly scoffing at all kinds of show. The psychologists tell us we should go slowly in discarding what ceremony still remains to our institutions. Man is fond of surrounding his thoughtful and solemn expressions with symbolism. The American laughs at the display of royalty and the "boast of heraldry," but he hurries to join a fraternal order and takes seriously the grandiloquent titles, the dress, and the rituals.

Orderly Procedure. A sense of genuine dignity should mark all public meetings. The chairman and the speakers should not lack in cordiality and intimacy, but as leaders they must take authority and responsibility with a sense of distinction and poise. They must proceed confidently with orderly method. They must carry out the program with dispatch but not with hurry. A chairman can do a great deal by easy and alert mastery, by skillful introduction of speakers to create a pleasurably expectant mood in the audience.

Seat the Audience Compactly. One practical device for making a united group is to have the audience sit close together. A small gathering scattered in a hall that will seat two thousand cannot be welded into a unit. Every individual in it is self-conscious, oppressed with a sense of propriety, and without the slightest temptation to abandon himself to a mass feeling. Henry Ward Beecher used to say his audience must touch elbows. Where there is plenty of room, audiences have a habit of leaving the first few rows vacant and of spreading out. There is no way of making the spark of suggestion leap the gulf between the speaker and his listeners. In such a case ask the audience to fill the front seats and bring the stragglers within the magic circle.

Actors will tell you how much difference there is between a performance given before a small matinee audience in the middle of the week and the one given before the big Saturday night crowd. The actors work harder before the small audience with much less satisfactory results. There is comparatively little evidence of enjoyment. There is no sign of intensity of feeling. There are a few chuckles and titters and mild perfunctory applause. The Saturday night crowd fills the house to overflowing and before the curtain rises is immersed in a sense of expectancy and whetted desire for entertainment. The first quip of the comedian goes off with a roar, and the house abandons itself to curiosity, suspense, and unbridled laughter. Suggestion has the place all to itself. The audience is almost hypnotized. They must be poor actors with a poor play to fail before such a crowd. Managers understand all this and give away a great many tickets if necessary to get sizable audiences.

Involuntary Attention. But the speaker cannot depend for long upon

these resources outside himself, helpful as they are. He must be able to take command under favorable or unfavorable conditions, weave the spell of interest, and sustain it to the end. Interest is a matter of holding the attention, and that is a matter of keeping out of the minds of the audience ideas that conflict or compete with those the speaker is advancing. The listener will attend to the ideas that are most clear and vivid. There are some things that capture our involuntary or passive attention, such as light, motion, color, taste, pain, heat, cold, sudden silence, or noise. The advertiser uses them to get his first attention. The public speaker does likewise when he makes an impressive beginning —that is, walks coolly to the front of the platform, pauses deliberately, waits for the involuntary curiosity of the audience to invoke silence, pauses another moment for silence to induce expectancy and confidence, and then speaks in a well-modulated, easily controlled tone that drives directly to the back of the room. Perhaps he will complete at once the process of making a psychological crowd by a remark or story that will get a hearty laugh, or by an anecdote that recalls common memories, or by an announcement or item of news that surprises or gratifies.

Sustained Interest. The speaker cannot of course hold this instinctive, arresting attention for more than a moment. It must be converted into the sustained interest that can hold the scientist for hours on a difficult problem, or the businessman on the details of a sales campaign, or the manufacturer on a new process that will save him money.

Attention Demands Variety. Interest is nothing but successive acts of attention. Attention cannot possibly fasten upon any *unchanging* object or idea for more than a few seconds at a time. Try it on a word or phrase in this sentence or on the arm of the chair or the orange on the table. If your active attention is engaged for a longer time it is because the object is *changing* in its aspects or significance; there are several things about it that you are noting one after the other. In other words, there can be no interest without variety. We pay attention to ideas that are constantly presenting differences, expanding into other ideas. William James says:

The condition *sine qua non* of sustained attention to a given topic of thought is that we should roll it over and over incessantly and consider different aspects and relations of it in turn.

The Law of Association. Change or novelty is not, however, sufficient in itself. Some listeners are interested in a speech that is a bore to others. The latter have too much familiarity with the subject or too little. The former find themselves with just the right balance of the new and the old. The more we know about a subject the more we are interested, provided there is the requisite variety, the new. The speaker may treat the subject in too elementary or commonplace a manner. On the other hand, if an audience has no background of knowledge or experience in the subject, the subject may be too novel to generate interest. You cannot interest me in a talk on traffic rates or the taxing of government bonds until you link it up with my own experience. James says in "Talks to Teachers":

> Any object not interesting in itself may become interesting through being associated with an object in which an interest already exists. The two associated objects grow, as it were, together; the interesting portion sheds its interest over the whole; and thus things not interesting in their own right borrow an interest which becomes as real and as strong as that of any natively interesting thing. . . . Associate the new with the old in some natural way so that the interest, being shed along from point to point, finally suffuses the entire system of objects of thought.

Teachers call this the law of apperception, and it is a most important principle of education. It implies logical thinking, a natural development of the child in all directions from his native interests, not a plastering of facts and information unrelated to the pupil's activities and experiences. "Have you learned your catechism?" asks the stern father in the Scotch comedy, "Bunty Pulls the Strings." "No," whimpers Rab, "I can't understand it." "I'm not asking you to understand it," roars the infuriated elder, "I want you to learn it."

Both the teacher and the speaker must adjust themselves to their audiences. To do this they must be so full of their subjects and so imag-

inative in their means that they can select, adapt, condense, expand, develop the theme rapidly or slowly as best meets the experience of most of their hearers. What John Dewey says about concentration in "How We Think" is applicable here:

> It means variety and change of ideas combined into a *single steady trend moving toward a unified conclusion.* . . . Holding the mind to a subject is like holding a ship to its course; it implies constant change of place combined with unity of direction.

Concreteness. Ideas, no matter how potent their possibilities, are pale and anemic things until they are energized by the images that move men. A generality or an abstraction means nothing until it is linked with a specific situation or example. Interest insists on a procession of pictures. Everybody still wants to see, hear, taste, touch, or smell and must have some definite piece of life and movement to carry him along the river of thought. Few of us get enough profit out of talks that are impersonal directions, or information, or advice. The alert speaker is continually saying, in effect: "This may seem simple, or commonplace, or far-fetched, or not important to you, but here is a case that you may examine for yourselves." A story, a hunt, suspense—and the audience pulls itself together.

Charles F. Kettering, president of the General Motors Research Corporation, in addressing the senior class of Ohio State University, had the difficult problem of interesting young men in a little more advice. His general ideas were of the kind they had heard often enough from intelligent and experienced elders. But the style made a difference. The profusion of incidents and situations from active business life gave vitality to commonplaces and informed the whole talk with a colorful drama that easily swept through indifference and cynicism.

Mr. Kettering made the observation, for instance, that "the only hard problem you will ever strike is the one you don't know how to solve. If you knew how to solve it, it wouldn't be a hard problem." Standing alone this remark is either too simple or too cryptic. The speaker goes at once to the illuminating story.

That was illustrated one time for me. A friend in the steel business, who always sends me samples of new kinds of steel, sent me a little sample of a very special material. I turned it over, purely by accident, to the foreman in the machine shop, and told him to drill it out and turn it over to the metallurgical department and have it analyzed. Shortly after that I saw him, and I said, "Did you turn that sample over to the metallurgical department?" He said, "They couldn't drill that at all; it is so hard that it is impossible to drill it." I asked him, "Did you try a diamond point drill on it?" He said, "No," and I told him to try that, and he drilled it. He told me something that wasn't so; he told me that steel was too hard to drill, and that wasn't the case at all. The steel was what it was. It was the drill that was too soft. That was the whole difficulty. Every time a hard job comes along, you will know it is a case of a soft drill. The job is what it is. You can't change the job.

A little later Mr. Kettering tackled another old idea. He said, "The opinion of everything has changed, and is changing, and that is all right. You cannot stop things from being different, because of that one fact alone. Values do not exist inherently in things at all." The listener thinks, "Well, that's so, but it's not very exciting. Why bother about it." But the speaker knows better than to leave it there. He sharpens the point and drives it home with this:

We realized that last year. In order to prove the necessity of openmindedness from the standpoint of change, we said, "Let's take the most perfect automobile that has ever been built up to the present time, and put it here in a glass case where we can all see it, and so it can never be changed in any of its physical characteristics, and let's assume, we will say, that that automobile is worth $2,000. Let's get one of these fine lettering experts to write in gold on a plate and say it has been appraised by all of this group as the finest product of its kind up to the present time, and that it is well worth the money, and put that plate inside the case. Now in a year let's come back and look at that same automobile. We will say, 'Well, that's not so good,' and we will have a debate, and then we will say that we have reached the conclusion that we should take $200 off its appraised value, and write that on the outside. The next year we will come back again and we will say, 'Well, that don't look so good,' and we will take $200 more off; and in ten years from now when we come back to it the only fellow who would bid on it would be the junk man."

Something has changed. What did change? The eye that looked through the case is the only thing that has changed. But what made the eye change? Because certain things have been done in the meantime that have caused that thing to look entirely different.

Consequently, in addition to the important things that you have to do, you must remember this, that there is nothing perfect in life. It's perpetually changing, and most people are all the time trying to stop the changes. The only place on the road of life where there are any park benches where we may sit down and rest and refresh ourselves, is immediately in front of the undertaker's establishment.

Imagination. The principle of attention indicates that what attracts is just one picture after another and that the clearer and more vivid the image is the more quickly we give ourselves up to it. It shows us that the specific and the concrete are much more effective than the abstract or the general. The generalities of mathematics, science, business, philosophy, politics, and art are conclusions and summaries of individual experiences and have definite meaning and emphasis chiefly for specially trained audiences that have already been up and down the paths of details that we call induction and deduction, synthesis and analysis. Although everybody is familiar to some degree with abstractions, the old pedagogic rule holds good in speaking: Proceed from the concrete to the abstract.

Imagination, then, is not what it so often means in popular usage—fancy, conjecture, idle dreaming. The dictionary defines it also as "the picturing power of the mind; the constructive or creative faculty." Imagination is accurate recall. It makes the absent thing real. It presents new ideas only as the rearrangement or different combination of familiar experiences. The person of imagination understands and sympathizes with others because he sees their experiences and lives as the projection of his own. They differ only in number and degree because of a different distribution and stress of heredity, environment, and training.

Imagination is the most necessary thing in a speaker's equipment because it reveals the most effective ways of bringing the audience and the speaker together. It chooses the right subject, limits the field of dis-

cussion, and decides whether the matter shall be chiefly narrative, descriptive, explanatory, or argumentative.

Narration. If you spent the summer in Europe you have a great deal of material for public speaking, but it needs careful selection and application. With one audience it may be advisable to stress the narrative, tell some interesting stories of what you saw, contrasts between prewar and postwar Europe. The time order makes your plan simple. You take your audience from one town or country to the next as you yourself came upon them. It is easy to interest your listeners in what happened. There is always plenty of action, color, dramatic contrast, adventure, and variety.

Description is usually combined with narration. It is difficult to hold an audience with long and detailed descriptions of buildings, paintings, persons, canals, monuments, or anything else. It is the moving picture that delights, the human reaction to the setting, the narrative that is made vivid by significant descriptive details. Jack London in casual, incidental strokes of description made us see and feel Alaska. If the speaker fails to fill in the picture, we do it with our imaginations.

Exposition: Use of Charts, Etc. Exposition or explanation is perhaps the most common form of development for the speaker on business topics. He would be more likely to speak to businessmen about the economic conditions in Europe and would try to show how they affected business in our own country. Or it may be a new process, a new invention, or a new method of marketing that is to be explained. Increased efficiency is the theme of many talks. Clearness is here the prime requisite, and the alert speaker will use every resource to secure it. Charts, maps, diagrams, drawings, pictures, are powerful aids in holding the attention and in assembling, explaining, and comparing details that are only with great effort seen and retained by the eye of the mind alone. The speaker should be careful in using a blackboard or other supplementary material to stand far enough at one side, when pointing out details, so that he will not obstruct the view. A common fault of speakers is to look continuously at the board or chart while talking and pointing out items. This produces indistinctness of tone, since the speaker

has his back to part of the audience and his eye controls none of it. Under these conditions attention quickly departs. Glance at the board only long enough to point out a detail. Let the pointer or finger remain there if it is necessary, but turn back at once to your audience. Turning away from it is not advisable except in the act of pointing.

Argument. Exposition is the basis of argument. A salesman frequently has to do no more than explain his proposition clearly, to show the facts and details that are significant to the customer. Argument speaks for a change. It must carefully introduce the subject by clear definition, by adequate review of conditions that have suggested the proposed change. Next must come sound analysis of the proposition. What are the issues involved, the questions that need to be answered in arriving at an intelligent conclusion? It is not enough that a thing be desirable. It must be practicable. Can it be done now or in the near future? is the test of its availability. Man is naturally averse to change. He dreads a step in the dark. The unprecedented thing

> . . . puzzles the will
> And makes us rather bear those ills we have
> Than fly to others that we know not of.

The speaker must compare his proposition with other courses of action; he must cite precedent, parallel cases, analogies, the opinions of experts—anything to show that the proposed step is not so new or strange as was thought, that it is really a very logical and safe step inevitably suggested by common experience.

The Counterproposition. If one is arguing against a proposition or resolution, he will look for a counterproposition, a substitute remedy for admitted evils, one which seems to have all the advantages expected of the original proposal and none of its disadvantages. All argument comes to be a weighing of alternatives, a study of the advantages and disadvantages of two or more possible steps. The debater who convinces and persuades is not afraid to discuss supposed weaknesses of his plan. He does not wait to be asked about them. He knows he cannot

make any progress with his proposition until he removes the prejudice created by obvious or widely advertised objections. He will good-humoredly, fairly, and patiently speak about them, show that they are not founded on facts or that the disadvantage is much less serious than was thought and can by no stretch of the imagination outweigh the important advantages of the action proposed.

Overcoming Prejudice. Today the world is deluged with argument. Traditions and institutions have crumbled. The familiar signs and guides are gone. What is the next step in our foreign or domestic policy, in business, education, immigration, and a host of other difficult problems, public and private? Most of them are concerned with social and emotional reactions. They will not be decided by the logic of mathematics alone. The best solution will come through sympathetic understanding of the experience of others.

One cannot argue successfully, persuade, until he has considered the interests of all the groups involved. Interests are desires, most of them selfish. Every group makes its own arguments to excuse or support, give countenance to these desires. This is special pleading, propaganda, exploiting helpful facts and "facts," and suppressing, overlooking, and condemning whatever would prevent unprejudiced observers and voters from approving. Unsound premises and false proportions or emphasis characterize this kind of argument.

It is the work of persuasion to pierce the strong emotional bias of each group concerned in a proposition by showing sufficient knowledge of their several points of view. Fairness, generosity, and practicality are necessary in dealing with them and in reconciling them with the speaker's point of view. The best speakers cannot have it all their own way in cases of serious conflict of opinion or desire. The decisions are usually the results of compromises on the part of everybody, but the persons who contribute the most in discussions and who obtain corresponding advantages are those who vigorously push their own causes and still respect and study those of their opponents. They seldom make the mistake of standing out for trifles and losing the bulk. They know the difference between the shadow and the substance and will not argue

long for both. They have in mind the conflicting interests of manufacturers, trade unionists, farmers, shippers, sailors, unskilled laborers, consumers, foreign countries. What are the obvious gains and losses? What sacrifices are only temporary? What will be the comparatively distant, but more important, consequences of the proposed action?

The Right Attitude. Men like to argue and are vain of their display. They want to win and will not admit defeat. They are engaged in intellectual battle and must save their faces. So we get more heat, less light, and less chance of any profitable business. One of the most illuminating passages in American literature is Franklin's account, in his "Autobiography," of how he disciplined himself in argument. As a young man he got great satisfaction out of beating everybody at that game. He soon saw, however, that he was not making any converts, that his victims did not join him in any crusades. They were merely nursing their humiliation and waiting for a chance to get back at him. Then he tried the Socratic method of asking shrewd, embarrassing questions and smiling at his opponent's discomfiture. The net result was probably worse. And yet Franklin became the most influential citizen of Philadelphia in business and politics and later was equally successful in national and international affairs. He had to learn that "molasses catches more flies than vinegar." He gradually put by his old irritating tricks and became American's greatest salesman. Franklin describes the final stage of his self-culture in argument as follows:

> [I retained] only the habit of expressing myself in terms of modest diffidence, never using, when I advance anything that may possibly be disputed, the words *certainly, undoubtedly,* or any others that give the air of positiveness to an opinion; but rather say, *I conceive,* or *apprehend,* a thing to be so and so; *It appears to me,* or *I imagine it to be so;* or *It is so, if I am not mistaken.* This habit, I believe, has been of great advantage to me when I have had occasion to inculcate my opinions and persuade men into measures that I have been from time to time engaged in promoting. And as the chief ends of conversation are to inform or to be informed, to please or to persuade, I wish well-meaning and sensible men would not lessen their power of doing good by a positive assuming manner, that seldom fails to disgust, tends to

create opposition, and to defeat most of those purposes for which speech was given to us. In fact, if you wish to instruct others, a positive dogmatical manner in advancing your sentiments may occasion opposition, and prevent a candid attention. If you desire instruction and improvement from others, you should not at the same time express yourself fixed in your present opinions. Modest and sensible men, who do not love disputation, will leave you undisturbed in the possession of your errors. In adopting such a manner, you can seldom expect to please your hearers, or obtain the concurrence you desire. Pope judiciously observes,

> "Men must be taught, as if you taught them not,
> And things unknown proposed as things forgot."

Steps in Logic. To think straight in debate or discussion you will find Dewey's analysis of a complete act of thought in "How We Think" helpful:

Upon examination, each instance reveals, more or less clearly, five logically distinct steps: (i) A felt difficulty; (ii) its location and definition; (iii) suggestion of possible solution; (iv) development by reasoning of the bearings of the suggestion; (v) further observation and experiment leading to its acceptance or rejection; that is, the conclusion of belief or disbelief.

He concludes the chapter with a passage that will appeal to the common sense of the businessman:

The disciplined, or logically trained, mind—the aim of the educative process—is the mind able to judge how far each of these steps needs to be carried in any particular situation. No cast-iron rules can be laid down. Each case has to be dealt with as it arises, on the basis of its importance and of the context in which it occurs. To take too much pains in one case is as foolish—as illogical—as to take too little in another. At one extreme, almost any conclusion that insures prompt and unified action may be better than any long delayed conclusion; while at the other, decision may have to be postponed for a long period—perhaps for a lifetime. The trained mind is the one that best grasps the degree of observation, forming of ideas, reasoning, and experimental testing required in any special case, and that profits the most, in future thinking, by mistakes made in the past. What is important is that the mind should be sensitive to problems and skilled in methods of attack and solution.

Unnecessary Argument. A common fault of the speaker is to give extended arguments when none are necessary. Many a man has seen a great light a little late and comes to the platform with the attitude of a teacher or pioneer. He does not know that his "stuff" is old and only bores an audience long since persuaded to his point of view. What the audience may need is, not argument, but suggestion, something to stir it to action. We are all united in our belief in many good causes and ideals, but we do not do much about them. The good speaker, in such a case, stimulates, arouses the sluggish temperament, fills the mind with new images, comparisons, analogies, anecdotes, and illustrations. He takes for granted that all believe. He is the preacher or salesman who transforms indifference to active desire. Deliberation, reasoning, is comparatively unimportant in this process.

Suggestion after Argument. When argument is necessary it will be more influential, as it must be more skillful, with the better educated audiences. In such instances suggestion is enormously more persuasive when it follows sound logic and concludes the speech. In fact the conclusion or peroration has in this respect the same function as has the "clincher" or concluding action-getting paragraph of the sales letter. It does not pack all its suggestion there. Suggestion has been at work from the opening words and accumulating force throughout the speech. It makes at the end a last swift appealing call to action that has already almost broken through the obstructions of doubt and indifference.

Suggestion in Analogy. Oliver Wendell Holmes used to pray for a good analogy to bring an explanation or an argument to life. The critics say analogy is not proof, but it is good enough for most of us. "It's like this," says the debater, and he tells us a little story of something else. We see a very obvious resemblance in one or more respects to the point in dispute, and the suggestion is strong that the situations compared are alike in all important respects. "You say A is like B. It looks reasonable and we approve of B. So we shall probably approve of A." An opponent, of course, will point out differences and try to make them seem important. He will also make the sage reflection that A is not B and that fact ought to be enough to put any intelligent per-

son on his guard. Analogies differ in their convincingness, but they will always be a popular and useful form of argument because of their power of suggestion. Here is a characteristic example from a speech on the Reform Bill, by Sydney Smith:

> They tell you, gentlemen, that you have grown rich and powerful with these rotten boroughs, and that it would be madness to part with them, or to alter a constitution which had produced such happy effects. There happens, gentlemen, to live near my parsonage a laboring man of very superior character and understanding to his fellow-laborers; and who has made such good use of that superiority that he has saved what is (for his station in life) a very considerable sum of money, and if his existence is extended to the common period he will die rich. It happens, however, that he is (and has long been) troubled with violent stomachic pains, for which he has hitherto obtained no relief, and which really are the bane and torment of his life. Now, if my excellent laborer were to send for a physician and to consult him respecting this malady, would it not be very singular language if our doctor were to say to him: "My good friend, you surely will not be so rash as to attempt to get rid of these pains in your stomach. Have you not grown rich with these pains in your stomach? Have you not risen under them from poverty to prosperity? You surely will not be so foolish and so indiscreet as to part with the pains in your stomach?" Why, what would be the answer of the rustic to this nonsensical monition? "Monster of rhubarb" (he would say) "I am not rich in consequence of the pains in my stomach, but in spite of the pains in my stomach; and I should have been ten times richer, and fifty times happier, if I had never had any pains in my stomach at all." Gentlemen, these rotten boroughs are your pain in the stomach—and you would have been a much richer and greater people if you had never had them at all. Your wealth and your power have been owing, not to the debased and corrupted parts of the House of Commons, but to the many independent and honorable members whom it has always contained within its walls. If there had been a few more of these very valuable members for close boroughs we should, I verily believe, have been by this time about as free as Denmark, Sweden, or the Germanized States of Italy.

Famous Quotations. The style, the authority, and the repetition of great sayings illustrate best of all the enormous power of suggestion.

Shakespeare and the Bible have profoundly moved men, not by argument but by suggestion. Some dramatic, moving quality has gone right past the intellectual censor, the demand for demonstrable proof, and has lodged permanently in the subconscious. Chauncey Depew, in an address on "The Art of Growing Older," gave a good example of this in referring to David's utterance in the ninetieth Psalm: "The days of our years are threescore and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labor and sorrow." Depew's comment was:

> No one knows how many untimely deaths this has occasioned. For this has been proclaimed from the pulpit as an inspired saying and men and women died because they believed it.

Suggestion in Slogans. Samuel Crowther has written a truthful as well as entertaining article entitled "Slaves to the Slogan—Catch Words as Collars." It begins:

> "You take the arguments, take all the right and justice in a political campaign," said a shrewd and seasoned politician to me the other day, "and if I can get a catch word or a slogan, I don't need any right or justice to make a good run against you and maybe to beat you. Even if I don't get a slogan for my man, but I do get a first-class epithet for yours, I will rustle you then, too.
>
> "The arguments, the campaign speeches, and all that do not much matter. Men and women do not reason their votes. They do not reason much about anything. They think in headlines—in words that are snappy. But nobody knows in advance how a word or phrase is going to catch on."

Crowther lists a few phrases that have decided big issues. Some of them are as potent as ever and just as easily contemptuous of mere argument. Note the different degrees of suggestion in these: *Old Hickory, Full Dinner Pail, He Kept Us Out of War, We Want Teddy, Bull Moose, Progressive, Reactionary, Collective Bargaining, Living Wage, Scab, Pure Food Law.* The word *lobbyist* has come to suggest wiliness and corruption of politicians; so the lobbyist now calls himself a *legislative agent* or an *executive secretary.* "*Publicity man* and *public relations counsel* in practice mean exactly the same thing," says Crowther,

"but there is no comparison between the respectability of the two titles. In the public mind a publicity man is merely a chronic liar."

Owen D. Young, whose speeches show a uniform awareness of psychological values, said this to a New York gathering:

What are the slogans which mislead us? One is that the grasping power company is trying to destroy the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls, and yet I think I am right in saying the latest studies show that in view of the erosion, scientific handling of the Falls must be had in order to preserve their beauty, and that it may be had consistent with great additional power development there.

Next time, the slogan is the destruction of the Adirondack forest—the playground for the people. I think I know every foot of the Adirondacks. I yield to no one in my love for them and in my desire to preserve them. I think I know the needs of the power companies. I would not impair the beauty of that great playground to develop power, nor would I permit any people having special interests, whether they be political or otherwise, to prevent the adequate use of these powers for the benefit of all the people of the State under a visionary and unfounded cry of forest destruction. Are we so incompetent in this State, Mr. Chairman, that we can not develop plans to conserve and use the waters of that great watershed for the benefit of all the people of the State without destroying or impairing in the least the beauty and the development of that great forest? Personally, I am sure we can.

And, finally, the most effective slogan of all—the power trust is trying to steal these natural resources for its own benefit and take them away from the people. Mr. Chairman, if there be a power trust, which I deny, most people would admit that I am competent to speak about it. It is evident that nobody can make a dollar out of these falling waters except by harnessing them for the service of the community. No capitalization of the developing company can be had and no rates can be charged except such as are approved by the Public Service Commission of the State. What is there to this charge of stealing the water powers if they can only be developed under State control, and if they can only make their money by rates approved by the State, and if their income can only arise from putting the power which is now going to waste to the service of the people?

Suggestion in Figures of Speech. Simile, metaphor, personification, apostrophe, allegory, synecdoche, and metonymy are some of the names

rhetoricians give to the various forms of striking images that speakers and writers use in attempting to make their literal or actual meaning clearer. The names are of little consequence. They all refer to comparisons expressed or implied. Everyone has, consciously or unconsciously, used most of the types many times. In fact, our language and every language is so encrusted with figures of speech that it is at times a little difficult to avoid the trite and commonplace ones.

The speaker should not deliberately seek the flowers and embroidery of speech. It is that practice which has made so many of our bygone orators seem artificial and insincere. They elaborated too much. By all means use the figure, the comparison, that rises naturally out of your attempt to visualize more accurately and sharply. Wit, humor, epigram, irony, exaggeration, climax, question, challenge, denunciation, revel in all sorts of bizarre, penetrating, or dazzling pictures.

Notice the number and variety of figures in this passage from the newspaper column of a well-known Washington correspondent:

Little progress was made towards the ship subsidy bill today. There was something *on the track*. . . . Then comes the army appropriation bill . . . and after that the *deluge,* i.e., the ship subsidy discussion. Incidentally, somewhere, somehow, the Borah resolution. That resolution now *lurks* and *gibbers* on the table. . . .

Senator Harrison is the embodiment of courtesy. Not for him the *knife-thrusts* of Caraway, who can stir hitherto peaceful, homeloving Republicans to the verge of *homicidal mania.* Not for him the sarcastic incisions upon the northern *hide,* loved by John Sharp Williams. Not for him the *thunder* and reddened visage of Robinson of Arkansas, lusty and *roaring* Democrat, who orates as from a *crimson haze* of frenzy. Harrison's is the *honeyed* way, the *broad highway banked* with *flowers,* the path of delight. Some of the flowers are of toxic qualities; the *bright foliage* may be kin to *poison ivy;* the *trickling springs* of eloquence may be deleterious. But the mass effect is not disagreeable. If we must die under the *blows* of speech, Let Harrison be the *executioner.*

Mixed Figures. You will best learn to use language simply and effectively by getting the habit of noting the actual meaning of indi-

vidual words. Do not toss off conventional patterns and phrases in a thoughtless, meaningless way. Words often carry a greater, or different, significance than intended. It is easy to mix figures in an absurd way. An idea may be illustrated by two or more pictures, but they must be combined with care. They may make something very strange and wonderful; a chimera, baffling, misshapen, and senseless. Here is an example from a weekly paper. The unfortunate perpetrator found his serious, sonorously oratorical question copied by the "colyumists" for a good laugh.

> Is there not in all this beloved commonwealth of ours some Moses that can grasp the reins of government and pull the ship of state out of the dirty political mire in which it is floundering?

This kind of blunder is made all too easily. Even Shakespeare nodded in the famous image, "to take arms against a sea of troubles." L. T. Townsend, in "The Art of Speech," gives a classic instance:

> Gentlemen, the apple of discord has been thrown into our midst; and if it be not nipped in the bud, it will burst into a conflagration that will deluge the world.

A Metaphor Analyzed. F. G. Blair, in an address before the National Education Association, shows in a very helpful way the importance of looking at hackneyed figures with a fresh and thoughtful regard.

> "America is the melting pot of the world." That statement has been declared by one of our literary critics to be the greatest figure of speech ever coined in this country. The man who uttered it, though born upon foreign soil, had become a truly, soundly American citizen. Some doubting Thomases, seeing the influx of foreign elements into our country, feared their disorganizing influences, knowing that every European war had found its response in America as something of the bitterness and hatreds were wafted across the ocean. They feared that these latent prejudices would endanger the unity, the solidarity, of American life. To these doubters this foreign-born American citizen made his famous statement, "Fear not, for America is the melting pot of the world."
>
> Everyone knows the concrete background of this figure. He has seen the junk man as he goes about collecting old iron. Here he picks up an old sew-

ing machine, with its bearings worn out, here an old hay rake, a threshing machine, a stationary engine, no longer fit for service. He loads them on the flat car, carries them to the foundry; where they are broken into little bits and heaved into the great caldron. There in that sparkling, sputtering mass we cannot tell where sewing machine begins or hay rake leaves off. This molten stream is run through conduits into new molds to fashion new sewing machines, new hay rakes, new threshing machines, new stationary engines, after a modern model, to do a larger quantity and a better quality of work within a given time.

The gentleman who coined this figure no doubt saw these human machines coming from the four corners of the earth, bringing with them their ancestral differences, their national prejudices, their difference in religious creeds; he saw them all cast into the great caldron of American life, melted down and molded into his conception of the new American citizen, who should live and work with his fellows in a spirit of good sportsmanship and in unity of effort toward the achievement of American ideals.

Of course, every figure of speech has its limitations. We do not want to melt out of these foreign elements those great qualities which have contributed so much to the upbuilding of our republic. We do not want the melting pot to take out of the Lindberghs those transcendent qualities that prepare them for preeminent American citizenship.

If this figure is a true expression of American influence, what is it in this country that does the melting? No doubt the great expanse of our country with its diversity of climate and natural resources does something in this line. No doubt the spirit of our form of government as expressed in its Declaration of Independence and its Constitution has something to do with it. No doubt our great principle of religious freedom has wrought mightily in this unifying process. But, speaking without any prejudice, I believe that the great American school system is the very pit of this melting pot. Here the ancient foreign prejudices are melted out of the youth and the best that was brought and the best that is here are fused together.

Suggestion Is Dramatic. Some form of suggestion is always at the bottom of emphasis, persuasion, eloquence. It is easy to discover it in others. Is it merely inspiration, a gift? Can the ordinary speaker find the material of suggestion and use it deliberately upon his audiences? He can, without a doubt, manage with forethought what others do by

instinct. Improvement begins with awareness—awareness of the fact that a good speaker is dramatic and a dull speaker undramatic. "Dramatic" does not mean "theatrical." We are all familiar with the playwrights and actors who try to palm off stagey old tricks as drama. "Theatrical" and "oratorical" describe them. The dramatic, on the other hand, is genuinely moving, truly suggestive.

Elements of Drama. Next, what is dramatic? Well, for one thing, all drama has conflict. We love a fight or a challenge. A sleepy convention of professors of public speaking was listening to the dull reading of papers. At last came a teacher who dared to speak. He strode to the front of the platform with easy assurance and woke up the crowd with this:

Gentlemen: Most of what I have listened to this morning I have to describe as "the bunk." We have all taught it, it sounds like something, but you know in your hearts that it doesn't work. It doesn't help to make speakers. If these papers are a sign, we have missed the main point entirely.

This was rash, even though the roguish smile was a little disarming. But it turned out to be just what was needed to keep the meeting from being a complete fizzle. The talk was followed by frank, vigorous and helpful discussion and debate. A good fight was enjoyed by all.

E. St. Elmo Lewis, in a talk on "Profitless Prosperity," anticipated a common objection with an ironical challenge:

You are part of a building industry which stands second in volume in dollars and cents among the industries in the United States—I am informed the Sand and Gravel industry represents an investment of $500,000,000—that your tonnage produces from 6 to 7 per cent of the gross revenues of the carriers.

Yet you are not making money—or, if you are, you are not making enough. I know, of course, your "business is different." Everybody tells me that. Every line of business tells me that. That is the reason why you are a different kind of men. (You can tell a Sand and Gravel man by looking at him!) That is why you have no costs, depreciation, obsolescence, no selling problems, no production problems, like all other businesses have. Yes, your business is not different! I have heard that "different" talk for forty years from over four

hundred lines of business—and it has always ended by learning how much alike business is. Then we learned something.

The speaker who has the audience with him in a fight against ideas is in the ideal position and, while a momentary shock of opposition may be stimulating, common ground, agreement, should be quickly sought. Though argument is challenge, we have noted that explanation is often more serviceable. But the exposition must be dramatic; that is, it must present pictures of conflict, of contrast. George Bernard Shaw, good public speaker and great debater, saw that the dramatic method would spread his ideas more widely and persuasively. He wanted to show, for instance, that everybody's income, in the capitalistic organization of society, is got eventually by robbing and grinding the poor. So he wrote "Widowers' Houses." He wished to prove that there can be no real spiritual or religious improvement in people until they are decently fed, clothed, and sheltered. So he wrote "Major Barbara." All his plays have plenty of debate, but it is significant that his best have less argument and more observation. The dramatist sees. He has a vision, and he illustrates it. He does not need proof, and it is usually when he proceeds to argue that he wavers and becomes less convincing. His illustrations and characters have the truth in them, and the audience draws the conclusion he desires.

Situations. The second point which the public speaker should note about drama is that it concerns itself with situations—incident and story. There is not only trouble, obstacle, conflict; there is steady movement toward something. We are in a hunt, a chase. We must see how this thing is going to turn out. "Suspense," the dramatists call it. The wise speaker, too, presents situations and problems for his audience to speculate about. And like the dramatist he does not tell the answer at once. He is interesting because his listeners cannot easily guess what is coming.

In his speech "America Is Too Rich to Be Loved," Owen D. Young was chiefly concerned with a somewhat technical and not very exciting exposition of the latest plan for German reparation payments. He sensed the problem of holding the attention of the college students he was

addressing on this none too romantic topic. As a world figure he might have been satisfied with the reflection that the young hero worshipers would get a sufficient thrill out of looking over someone they had heard and read so much about. But he did not let it go at th .t. The speech is not only lightened by clear, simple, illuminating statement, but by a remarkable example of the dramatic technique we have just been considering. Examine this passage, which appears after the two short paragraphs of greeting:

On the eleventh day of November, 1918, the military forces engaged in the great war suspended operations. For more than four years they had been our masters. They commanded our thoughts and our ambitions; they took as hostages our property and our lives; politics had retired to a second place; economics had been temporarily forgotten.

After the military had suspended its acts in the tragic drama, politics and economics again came to the stage. Politics, as she advanced to the footlights, had never seemed so charming. She received the applause of all the world. How delightful to get rid of that old witch of war who destroyed our wealth and our peace of mind, who murdered our sons and who disarranged all the notions of our daughters! Is it any wonder that politics commanded our admiration?

What high hopes we had of her! True, there was on the stage also a modest being, known as Economics. No one paid much attention to her in comparison with their lovely idol. Politics was mistress of the world. And with that setting, the play began.

Politics, conscious of her power and with impatient hands, wrote a treaty while all the world was lost in admiration of her daring. In those days a part of her charm lay in her many moods. One day she spoke through Woodrow Wilson, and audiences sat breathless, moved by the high idealism of a great man and the rich expression of a master. Another day, by contrast, she was hard and cynical, and what the world calls practical, as she spoke through Clemenceau. And still another time she had the delightful abandon and irresponsibility of a mischievous mistress as she was impersonated by Lloyd George. And she had courage, too, because she swept away age-old boundaries and made new ones.

Occasionally was heard the weak voice of Economics modestly protesting here and there, occasionally even offering advice, only to be silenced by the

imperious gestures of the leading lady. And one day she decided that Germany should pay by way of reparations, the sum of 132,000,000,000 marks, or one-quarter as many dollars. Then it was indeed time for Economics to speak, and she did, in protest. But she was quickly silenced by the great party in the Palace of Versailles, the scene of so many grand affairs. Had not Politics always been mistress of Versailles? Had not Economics always been a scullery maid? Why break the precedent now? Why listen to her in these great councils—and they didn't. And then

"The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart."

Permit me to carry the figure one step further. Politics now goes on tour, always taking her bedraggled associate with her, because even Politics knows that Economics must do the work. Politics in France says, and properly and sympathetically so:

"Your houses and lands have been destroyed. Rebuild them, and do it handsomely—others will pay the costs." That was the program which Politics could start but which Politics could not stop. So the building went extravagantly on, and a few years later, when Germany failed to pay the cost and consequently there overhung France an addition to her vast interior debt, Politics said:

"We will make Germany pay. We will move our armies into the Ruhr and compel by force the production of coal and manufactured goods for reparations account."

But it turned out that the sword was a poor instrument with which to get coal and steel. Politics could put a French army in the Ruhr, but Politics could not take it out.

Politics in England said: "If there be people out of work, or even people who do not want to work, give them a dole with the public treasury."

How generous she was! But there was a program which Politics could start but which Politics could not stop.

Politics in Germany said to Economics: "You seemed depressed this morning with the great work you have to do. Let me give you a cocktail. I do not intend to get you intoxicated. Take a little stimulant, and after you are started we will cut it out."

So Politics gave to Economics inflation. That was something which Politics could start, but which Politics could not stop. As a result, the currency of

Germany was destroyed and her people were plunged into the depths of want and despair. Yes, it is easy for Politics, with her appeal to the emotions and her ingratiating manner, to start things in the field of Economics which Politics cannot stop.

And so it happened in the Autumn of 1923. Then, for the first time, Economics got a hearing. The world began to doubt whether Politics, with all her charm, was safe and sound. Losing the applause of her audience, and with that something of her confidence, Politics finally called to Economics and said: "If I give you the opportunity will you try to save the show?"

Reference to Common Experience. The third factor in sustaining the thrill of drama is constant reference to the experience of the audience. No play can succeed without that vital searching. One reason old plays, the classics, lose their grip is that a number of homely, common reminders of current life have disappeared. The dress, the language, the situations are different. Humanity is, of course, the same in all times, and the old play that has real characters in fundamental conflicts will survive. But it will not so quickly and surely take hold of unimaginative minds. Its problems at first glance do not seem to be our own.

Now the speaker is in somewhat this situation if he does not frankly ask himself what is the use of talking about this or that topic to the audience he will meet. The playwright succeeds because he is aware of other people. He observes them accurately and sympathetically. They are quite different from himself in taste, thought, manner, language, experience. This awareness, so characteristic of the artist, must direct the speaker's purpose, plan, and detail. His thinking about his topic may begin with a few questions:

1. Does this sound like a dull subject to most people?
2. Why do they feel this way about it?
3. Are they right?
4. What have they overlooked?
5. Would this make any difference in their general attitude of indifference?
6. If the information is not significant to them, can I hold the attention by making a good story out of the subject?
7. Have I anecdotes, gossip, humorous episode, a little mystery, surprise?

8. Can I make a startling contrast between what they think the subject is and what it really is?

9. Can I begin with a pleasant little narrative that is interesting in itself and that is also pertinent to the subject?

10. Will some fictitious conversation (drama) illustrate a point more effectively than the usual explanation?

A student began a talk on "The Duties of a Secretary" in this fashion:

"There are three kinds of secretaries: the private, the business, and the organizational."

This is hopeless except possibly for a class studying to be secretaries. The title is bleak and the first words sound as though they were taken out of the primmest and grimmest textbook. The subject itself is not too promising, but like every other subject it can be dramatized. The dramatic habit of mind is not long in discovering a treatment with more challenge, surprise, situation, narrative, problem, hunt.

1. The secretary may be a much more dignified and influential person than you suspect.
2. There are fascinating opportunities in secretarial work.
3. Examples of well-known persons who have achieved striking success through their skill as secretaries.
4. The requirements for the occupation.
5. Present and future prospects for gain in this field.

Drama should begin the speech. A little playful and friendly reference to the presumed dullness of the topic may awake the sleepy, jolt or disarm the frowning.

The secretary is more than the office wife. Her job is something more than to type letters, to keep things neat and handy, to put flowers on the boss's desk and eventually to marry him. A stenographer may be satisfied with this modest performance, but the secretary is likely to manage the business as well as the boss.

The secretary's is not a new occupation. She is privileged to engage in an ancient and honorable calling that has been dignified by some of the greatest personages in history. The old Roman *secretarius* was a confidant, one who was trusted with the *secreta,* the secrets of his employer's business, and the modern American secretary must be capable of a like responsibility.

Give-and-take. To close the comparison with drama, public speaking is not a one-way performance. It is two-way or circular. It has been defined as heightened conversation, give-and-take. The man who reads, recites, spouts, or merely "delivers" or "unloads" his speech gets little response. The friendly, questioning, searching eye, mind, and voice are not satisfied merely to expound, explain. "Take it or leave it" is not their style. They invite speculation and comment. Communication comes to life. Communion may be the miracle. Back and forth go the waves of understanding and the intimacy of true talk.

Summary. In discussing the psychology of public speaking it is easy to go on indefinitely about many things that may appropriately be considered in a study of the human mind. The point of it all is that the speaker must study himself and his audience—with the emphasis on the latter. Every student should in the beginning consciously improve his sense of objectivity. He has something to say to a particular audience, the individuals of which are clearly visualized. Every idea in the speech should be referred to the nature and needs of this group before the address is given in public. Deliberate, conscious adaptation should be the rule until the right point of view is a habit. This determines in the end everything that is said and how it is said. The proportions of argument, of suggestion, of exhortation, of narration and of description, what to omit, what to modify, how to interest, and how to secure action are questions to be answered effectively only by the disciplined, practical, imagination that knows the fundaments of both individual and mass psychology.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Examine the rhetorical devices in this familiar passage from Robert Ingersoll. Point out examples of alliteration, personification, repetition, balance, simile, metonymy, metaphor, euphony, and climax. What devices are most prominent? Why do you enjoy the selection? Why is it not quite convincing?

Read the passage aloud frequently. It furnishes excellent practice for poise, deliberation, pause, voice placement, and expansive and authoritative tone and action.

A little whole ago, I stood by the grave of the old Napoleon—a magnificent tomb of gilt and gold, almost fit for a dead deity—and gazed upon the sarcophagus of black Egyptian marble, where rest the ashes of that restless man. I leaned over the balustrade and thought about the career of the greatest soldier of the modern world.

I saw him walking upon the banks of the Seine contemplating suicide. I saw him at Toulon; I saw him putting down the mob in the streets of Paris; I saw him at the head of the army in Italy; I saw him conquer the Alps and mingle the eagles of France with the eagles of the crags; I saw him at Marengo, at Ulm, and Austerlitz; I saw him in Russia where the infantry of the snow and the cavalry of the wild blast scattered his legions like winter's withered leaves; I saw him at Leipsic in defeat and disaster—driven by a million bayonets back upon Paris—clutched like a wild beast—banished to Elba. I saw him escape and retake an empire by the force of his genius. I saw him upon the frightful field of Waterloo, where Chance and Fortune combined to wreck the fortunes of their former king, and I saw him at St. Helena, with his hands crossed behind him, gazing out upon the sad and solemn sea.

I thought of the orphans and widows he had made, of the tears that had been shed for his glory, and of the only woman he ever loved, pushed from his heart by the cold hand of ambition; and I said I would rather have been a French peasant and worn wooden shoes; I would rather have lived in a hut with a vine growing over the door and the grapes growing purple in the rays of the autumn sun; I would rather have been that poor peasant with my loving wife by my side, knitting as the day died out of the sky, with my children about my knee and their arms about me; I would rather have been that man and gone down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust than have been that imperial personification of force and murder.

II. Scott Fitzgerald, in his play "The Vegetable," has a little fun at the expense of a certain type of public speaker. He says he found the following speech, given by one of the characters, in the *Congressional Record*. Make a list of the mixed figures and explain the illogical combinations. Cite other mistakes and absurdities in the passage:

Gentlemen, before you take this step into your hands I want to put my best foot forward. Let us consider a few aspects. For instance, for the first aspect let us take, for example, the War of the Revolution. There was ancient Rome, for example. Let us not only live so that our children who live after us, but also that our ancestors who preceded us and fought to make this country what it is! . . . And now, gentlemen, a boy today is a man tomorrow—or, rather, in a few years. Consider the winning of the West—Daniel Boone and Kit Carson, and in our own time Buffalo Bill and—and Jesse James! . . . Finally, in closing I want to tell you about a vision of mine that I seem to see. I seem to see Columbia—Columbia—ah—blind-folded—ah—covered with scales—driving the ship of State over the battlefields of the republic into the heart of the Golden West and the cotton fields of the Sunny South.

III. Show how the following speech illustrates several principles in the psychology of public speaking. Tell how Mr. Barton uses argument, anecdote, quotation, drama, to hold attention.

ADVERTISING A FORCE FOR GREATER CIVILIZATION

By Bruce Barton, writer and advertising man, before The National Industrial Advertisers Association, Atlantic City, Oct. 19, 1925

Introduction

- I. What Samuel Johnson said.
- II. Stuart Chase on waste in advertising.
    - A. Cain and Abel.
    - B. Problem of distribution.

Body

- I. Cost of distribution to be relatively larger.
    - A. Activities charged against it.
- II. Advertising, like all competition, wasteful.
    - A. Competition alone makes progress.
    - B. Number of gasoline pumps.
    - C. Government operation would mean slowing down of industry.
- III. Advertising the driving force behind production.
    - A. Savage tribe compared with city dwellers.
    - B. Ruskin: "There is no wealth but life."
        - 1. Release of human energy.
- IV. Advertising men should have humility.
    - A. Advertising growing and changing.
    - B. Nobody an advertising expert.

Conclusion

I. Anecdote of Henry Irving.
II. Laplace.
III. Servants in a great cause.

CUE CARD

1. Sam Johnson
2. Stuart Chase
3. Cain and Abel
4. Cost of distribution
5. Competition
6. Government operation
7. Savages versus citizens
8. "No wealth but life"
9. Humility
10. Irving, Laplace

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Convention: I appreciate very much your invitation to come down here and the distinguished position that you have assigned me on your program.

"The trade of advertising is now so near to perfection that it is not easy to propose any improvement." This optimistic estimate of our profession and our activities is not my own. It was said in London by Samuel Johnson in 1759. And the fact that we are here this morning is evidence, I take it, that we do not accept entirely this very flattering judgment upon advertising or our own efforts in it.

We are here, as I take it, because we are unsatisfied, because we believe that advertising can be and ought to be a very much more efficient and economical servant of distribution and of mankind in general, and what I am going to do in the few minutes assigned to me is not to make a speech, but to touch on three or four very simple points which other speakers will perhaps touch on more fully, but which are so simple that I am sure all of you have thought about them a good many times.

Just before I came down here somebody put on my desk an article from the New Republic on the waste of advertising, written by a man whom I know, Mr. Stuart Chase. Mr. Chase pointed out that more than half the printing presses of the United States are continuously engaged in turning out advertising, that, if this tremendous Niagara of words were filtered down into a little stream of a single line of type, that line would circumscribe the whole universe. He pointed out that this great cataract cannot of itself cause a single additional wheel to turn or bring forth out of the earth a single additional potato or pound of iron or lead, or any other form of natural wealth, and he bemoaned the fact that there are over 600,000

of us engaged in advertising, who, if advertising were made a state monopoly, as he would like to have it, would be released, as he said, for productive labor.

That line of reasoning is, of course, very, very old. The complaint and irritation of those who are engaged in purely productive activities, as against those who make their living in any other way, goes back, I suppose, to the very beginning of the human race. In fact, we know it does. We know Adam had two sons; one was Cain and the other was Abel; Cain was a farmer; Abel was a herdsman. It was because Cain, whose back was tired from bending over his garden, looked up across the valley and saw Abel sitting there on the side of the hill, tending his flocks and watching them grow fat (and adding to his bank account by growing fat), that Cain was inflamed with anger against Abel and killed him and became the first murderer.

Cain had a great-great-great-grandson, whose name was Lamech. Lamech had three sons, one of whom was Tubalcain, the founder of everything we have here; that is, he was the first blacksmith, the first worker in steel and iron, the first manufacturer. And he had a brother, whose name was Jabal, who was the first musician, who, as the Bible says, was the father of all who play upon the organ and the harp. What Tubalcain's feelings toward Jabal were is not stated in the records, but it doesn't require much stretch of the imagination, I think, to picture. Undoubtedly he thought that the time that Jabal put in in playing the harp was utterly wasted; undoubtedly he said to himself, "There can be no question about it, if this fellow Jabal would get done with his foolishness in playing around with that harp and put in an extra hour a day in the garden, the whole world would be better off."

Well, we have lived a great many centuries since then, and we have solved or are in the process of solving very rapidly the whole problem of production. When I say, "We have solved it," I know that none of you would assent to that, because you know that there are great tasks yet to be done. But we have gone so far toward solving it that our progress is almost incredible. When farmers are in trouble these days, it isn't because they don't raise enough; it is because they raise too much.

Henry Ford said to me one day that he expected to make tractors and other machinery so cheap that a comparatively small number of people working a comparatively few number of weeks a year would be able to feed the whole human race, and you know what has been going on in your own factories. I see it in the clients whom we represent. Take these electric lights that we all have in our homes. The price of them has been reduced by the electric manufacturers four times in the past two years. Yet the percentage of profit is still very great, and the advertising appropriation is very satisfactory. The reduction has been made possible by the fact that one girl working with machines can today do what fifteen or twenty girls used to do.

The same thing is true in every factory, as you men know. One man working

with electricity, steam and machinery can do what ten men or twenty men or even one hundred men used to do. The point is that the other nine or nineteen or ninety-nine are released, not to loaf or to be a mere burden upon their fellows, but they are released for the arts and the sciences, for literature, for exploration, to be doctors, to be musicians, to be teachers, to be preachers, to be advertising men, to embroider and enrich this wonderful fabric which we call modern civilization.

The cost of production, I take it, is going to become smaller and smaller relatively, and the cost of distribution, so called, is going to become larger and larger relatively. I never argue against that statement, because against the ledger of distribution is charged not merely the processes of handling goods, but all of these other activities of the doctor and the musician and the artist and the teacher and the advertising man. Distribution is expensive and is going to become more expensive, not because it is inefficient, but because against it is charged all of the activities that make modern civilization most worth while and living most comfortable and worth having.

That may not be sound economics, but it seems to me it is common sense, and I think we weaken our cause, as advertising men and as salesmen, when we try to argue that distribution is inexpensive or ever again will be inexpensive. Production will become cheaper and cheaper; distribution, against which all the other activities of the human race are charged, is going to become more and more expensive, because life gets richer and richer as we live along.

The second thing I never attempt to argue against is that advertising itself is very expensive and often very wasteful. Contrast the conditions in the homes where you live with the conditions in the homes where you grew up. In my home as a boy we received one religious weekly, one country weekly and the Century Magazine. In my home today—thanks to the gracious generosity of the publishers—I don't know how many publications I receive. In addition to that, there is contesting for my attention the motion picture and the billboard and the street-car card and the radio and the theatre, none of which played a part in the life of my parents.

One of my friends, who is a prominent newspaper publisher, set a man to work in his office in a room alone to read through one daily edition of the New York Times. He was to read as fast as he could, but was to read every word, headlines, news, editorials, display advertising, want advertising—skipping nothing. How long do you think it took him? It took him fourteen hours. There is fourteen hours of reading matter turned out to divide the attention of people who on the average, I presume, give not more than fourteen minutes to it.

We are not in our minds a thousand times more able than our parents—we know that—and it stands to reason that with this tremendous pull and tug upon our interests no single page of printed matter, whether it be so-called literature or advertising, can possibly have the attention value that such a page had years ago.

Advertising is wasteful, because all form of competitive activity is wasteful. Yet it is only because we have a competitive system that we make progress. Twenty years ago the Government broke up the Standard Oil Company, and today as you drive up through New York or New England you pass a garage in front of which you find, not one pump seeking to sell you gasoline, but two pumps or three pumps or even ten pumps—and that is very wasteful; your soul cries out against it. But suppose the Government had taken over the Standard Oil Company twenty years ago, as Mr. Chase and men like him would like to have it. I venture to say at this very hour the people of the United States would be in the throes of a gasoline shortage, because the only force under heaven that will drive men into the wilds of Mexico and into the wilds of Venezuela and into every other unexplored and untamed spot on the universe in search of oil is the force of competition, desire to get ahead, in comparison with those we are competing against.

The same thing is true in advertising. If the Government were to take over advertising as a national monopoly, which Mr. Chase suggests, instantly the wheels of industry would slow down, because the force that drives industry forward is the desire on the part of the manufacturer to have a larger share in that great volume of public good will and public facts, and that desire is what inspires him to establish the laboratory, is what makes him discontented with his production costs, is what makes him unwilling to shoulder unfair and unnecessary distribution costs and taxation costs. That eternal reaching out is the thing that builds progress, and advertising is the most powerful force in that direction.

That brings me to the third thing which I just want to hint at and leave with you, and that is that advertising, far from being non-productive, as Mr. Chase says, is actually the inspiring and driving force behind all production, and the builder of civilization.

You go into a savage tribe, and what do you find? You find men who have no wants. You find that the savage is perfectly content if he can have a skin to wrap around his loin, another skin to keep the rain off his head, another skin to lie on, and a little food and a fire. So a savage tribe can continue for a thousand years, and there will be no change, and their great-great-grandchildren will be living as their great-great-grandfathers lived. But suppose that out of an aeroplane an advertising man dropped into that tribe, and with him came pictures of red neckties and tan shoes and underwear and automobiles and bicycles and new hats and feathers and strings of beads—instantly there would begin in that tribe a transformation. Wants would be kindled, and the desire to satisfy those wants would overcome all other desires, and in obedience to that desire even a savage is willing to abandon his life of leisure and voluntarily enlist himself in a servitude in the creation of a civilization.

John Ruskin said that "there is no wealth but life," and that, it seems to me, is the thing that economists of the type of Mr. Chase overlook. Wealth consists not

in things, it consists in people, in human energy, in human ambitions, hopes and achievements, and it is possible by holding up before a man a picture of things that he wants and a goal toward which he is striving to transform that man from a ten-horsepower man into a thousand horsepower man And there isn't anybody here, or anybody of intelligence anywhere who hasn't in his own experience found that under the impulse of some great desire he could do something which astonished himself.

That, I say, is the real wealth of the nation, human life, the releasing of human energy, the multiplication of a man's own power by the heightening of his desires and the lifting of his ambitions And that, I take it, is the great service of advertising, and any man who says you can deduct that force from modern life and still have progress as rapid or life as rich speaks without any real knowledge of the fundamentals of human nature

Finally, the thing with which I want to conclude is this that it behooves us, it seems to me, as advertising men, to adopt and to keep an attitude of great humility, as those who are in the presence of something very much greater than themselves

I am terribly shocked sometimes, not often, but once in a while, to see myself referred to somewhere as a great advertising expert Nothing could be farther from my thought than to picture myself in that way My attitude toward advertising, I hope, is the attitude of the scientist in the laboratory toward electricity. You ask him what electricity is, and he tells you frankly that he does not know You ask him what electricity does, and he will answer that by constant experiment, by study, by trial and failure, bit by bit, they are able to build up a record of experience by which they can tell just a little about the laws governing this great force and the way in which it acts and can be used for human progress And that ought to be our attitude toward advertising We deal with something which is not con crete and visible, something which cannot be weighed or measured or seen We deal with human nature, with the fluctuating ambition and taste and desire of men and women, with the changing impulses and emotions to which they can be made to respond, and as long as human life continues and men and women of different types and personalities are born into the world, advertising is going to be a constantly growing, changing and shifting thing, and nobody can claim to be an advertising expert, nobody can claim to be anything more than a servant of a force which is far greater than himself and the outer fringes of whose garments he can only just touch.

A friend of Henry Irving went around in back of the stage one night (this was when Irving was a very old man and at the top of his profession) after a perform ance which had lifted the audience out of its seats, and he found Irving in his dressing-room with his face buried in his hands, depressed by what seemed to him the utter inadequacy of his performance, sunk into gloom by the thought that he

was an old man and probably would not be allowed to live long enough to become what he, according to his own standards, considered a really good actor.

Laplace, the great astronomer, died, you remember, perhaps at the age of seventy-eight, and his last words were wonderful. He said, "What we know is nothing; what we have to learn is immense."

That, it seems to me, is the only safe attitude for a conscientious advertising man to take. Never have a feeling that we know it all; never assume the foolish and untenable position that we are wholly efficient or that bad advertising does not add to the cost of distribution just as good advertising detracts from the cost of distribution. Never assume any such position as that, but assume a position of humility in the presence of this great force, a feeling that we still have everything to learn, and yet a feeling of self-respect and of confidence in the knowledge that we are servants in a very great and a very worthy cause.

QUESTIONS ON THE ADDRESS

1. Discuss Mr. Barton's use of quotations and famous names.
2. How effective is the analogy from the Bible?
3. Is the rebuttal of Mr. Chase's argument convincing?
4. Why is distribution to be more expensive?
5. Is the problem of production almost solved?
6. Will competition continue to be "the life of trade"?
7. Discuss Mr. Barton's argument against government ownership.
8. Discuss the analogy about electricity.
9. Make a study of narrative—anecdote, story—as the most characteristic element of Mr. Barton's technique.
10. How does this speech illustrate some of the principles of attention?

TOPICS SUGGESTED BY THE ADDRESS

1. Waste in Advertising
2. Comments on "Prosperity: Fact or Myth," by Stuart Chase
3. Radio Advertising
4. "Tell It to Me Often Enough, and I'll Believe It"
5. Educating through Advertising
6. Can Prices Be "Stabilized"?
7. Cooperation versus Competition
8. Advertising as a Business Builder
9. Advertising Mediums
10. Does Advertising Increase the Cost to the Consumer?
11. Reason-why Copy

12. Slogans Good and Bad
13. Does Advertising Make Business More Honest?
14. Moving-picture Advertising
15. Does Advertising Make the Herd Mind?
16. Common Factors of Attention in Advertising and Public Speaking

TOPICS FOR TALKS

1. Russia and Religion
2. The Dardanelles
3. Turkey Today
4. This Believing World
5. Karl Marx
6. Behind the Counter
7. Soap Operas
8. Living in a Dormitory
9. Cover Girl
10. Social Workers
11. Wacs and Waves
12. Home Sweet Home
13. Heard at a Woman's Club
14. Camp Counselors
15. The Comic Page
16. The Way to Travel
17. A Survey of Magazines for Women
18. Interior Decorating
19. Building That Dream House
20. Cosmetic Ads
21. The Wheel of Fortune
22. Political Upheaval
23. Shakespeare in the Movies
24. Overtime
25. Lack of Discipline

CHAPTER XII

IMPROVING YOUR VOCABULARY

"We ain't burglars. [Tom Sawyer to his gang.] That ain't no sort of style. We are highwaymen. We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money."

"Must we always kill the people?"

"Oh, certainly. It's best. Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them—except some that you bring to the cave here, and keep them till they're ransomed."

"Ransomed? What's that?"

"I don't know. But that's what they do. I've seen it in books; and so of course that's what we've got to do."

"But how can we do it if we don't know what it is?"

"Why blame it all, we've *got* to do it. Don't I tell you it's in the books? Do you want to go to doing different from what's in the books, and get things all muddled up?"

Tom was already muddled. When pressed further about his pet word he offered several definitions that were definite only in quite definitely putting his fellows also in the muddle.

We can sympathize with Tom. We, too, have been fascinated and victimized by words that we liked to roll under the tongue without knowing just what they meant. Other words we have chewed long after their flavor had gone. All the time we felt uneasily that our lives were a tangle of words and that we ought to find some formula for using "proper words in proper places."

Professor H. A. Overstreet, in that remarkably helpful book "Influencing Human Behavior," says:

It is not sufficiently understood, perhaps, that the power of a mind is directly conditioned by its verbal equipment. A person with a very small vocabulary inevitably has a small range of thought. A person with a larger range

of vocabulary has a larger range of thought. The reason for this is fairly clear. Suppose a person has never heard of the word "ethnology." He consequently does not possess the clearly defined idea-system suggested by that word. Suppose now he learns the meaning of the word, so that he can use it freely. A new idea-system has been added to his stock. Thus, as our effective vocabulary increases, our thought-systems increase.

Even by the simple process of increasing our verbal tools, therefore, it is within our power to increase our thought-systems. Now the same result occurs when we attempt to substitute for phrases that are vague, colorless, and commonplace, phrases that express our meanings with greater vividness, subtlety, and precision.

To clarify a phrase, therefore, is to do more than engage in a mere bit of literary brightening. It is to clarify one's mind. Thus by becoming thoughtful about our commonplace phrases we become thoughtful about our commonplace ideas. We begin to probe them; to modify them; and sometimes to discard them altogether. And so we begin to shape ideas of our own that are less commonplace—which signifies the quite noteworthy fact that we have passed out of the stage of easy acceptance of phrase and idea into the stage of individual creation.

The ordinary student has a limited vocabulary for everyday use, a somewhat ampler one for writing, and a comparatively large vocabulary for reading. He knows the approximate meaning of thousands of words that he sees frequently in print but never uses in conversation. He has never taken the trouble to learn their exact meaning, their pronunciation, and their idiomatic use. He has learned, perhaps from sad experience, that although two words have apparently the same meaning, the one cannot always take the place of the other without ludicrous results. Then, too, he fears the new word will sound strange or affected. He recalls the smart young person who seems to be always showing off his recently acquired words and who makes anything but a favorable impression upon his listeners. So he becomes habituated to the feeble, inexact, and poverty-stricken vocabulary of a few hundred words, although a little systematic effort would easily yield him several thousand words that ought to be at the command of every educated man and woman. There is no copyright on words, no class privilege, although they add

distinction to their masters. Use a word two or three times and it will be your ready servant for life.

Honest Thinking. Words are the tools we use in recreating for others the impressions, ideas, pictures, and enthusiasms in our minds. The test of their efficiency is their accuracy and vividness. Not only must we have a large variety of words for good workmanship, but we must also frequently examine them to be sure they are sharp, for words, like other tools, often lose their edge. Honest, active thinking is necessary for growth in language power. We rest too willingly upon the few conventions we were brought up in, upon the symbols and catch phrases that we have acquired and which take the place of the individual and harder thinking that builds personality. It is easy to make a long list of stale and worn-out expressions, threadbare "hand-me-downs" commonly heard in public speaking. Some of them were once good, but they have been worked to death by excessive, thoughtless repetition.

Bromides. Here are a few of the most obvious. They will suggest many others:

Unaccustomed as I am to public speaking
We are indeed fortunate in having with us
It is a rare privilege
The inner man
Do justice to
Last but not least
Sad but true
Human frailty
Filthy lucre
Favor with a selection
Render a vocal solo
Along these lines
Specimen of humanity
The proud possessor
The man in the street
The average man
God's country
The coming generation
Man, woman, or child
Each and every
Grand and glorious nation
A friend of the workingman
One hundred per cent Americanism
With all due consideration
All that I can say is
Treated us royally
Supreme sacrifice
Long-felt want
I will do all in my power
The powers that be
Wall Street
Beloved and respected by all who knew him
A power for good in the community
We are standing today
In conclusion
There are so many abler speakers than I

The same lack of vigor and discrimination, deliberate thinking, is noticeable, however, in most oral and written speech. Avoid the following trite similes and metaphors:

As sharp as a razor
As dull as a hoe
As slippery as an eel
As brave as a lion
As white as a sheet
As light as a feather
Good as gold
Quick as a flash
Strong as a horse
Straight as an arrow
Fits like a glove

Ran like a deer
The lap of luxury
The school of life
The last straw
A death grip
Bled white
Backs to the wall
Slipped a cog
A cog in the machine
Where the shoe pinches
Gilt-edged securities

Newspaper headline writers are perhaps the worst offenders in this respect. Franklin P. Adams did us all a service with this entertaining jibe at his fellows:

He "scores," he "slaps," he "hits" and "flays,"
He "lauds," he "seethes" and "flaunts" and "flouts,"
He "probes" and "urges," "balks" and "slays."
He "seeks," "locates," "denies" and "scouts,"
He "bolts," he "wars," "declares" and "aids,"
He "passes lie," "indorses pledge."
Oh, I can stand "appeals" and "raids"—
But spare me from that word "allege."

A magazine joke adds literary words, once smart, now the chief reliance of dull critics.

Editor of the Book Review Supplement (to minion): "You're fired! You've written a review without using the words 'implicit,' 'naïve,' 'milieu,' or 'the American scene'!"

Exaggeration. Many fine words have been spoiled by careless exaggeration. Tossing them about too freely has dissipated their force or beauty. The skillful speaker or writer now hesitates to use *awful, ter-*

rible, ghastly, excruciating, nice, wonderful, lovely, splendid, worth while, red-blooded, elegant, clever, horrid.

Nobody escapes altogether these traps of blanket words and terms that indicate lazy or hazy thinking. You can make a list from the professor's talk as well as from your own. You can find them in almost any book. They are perpetual reminders that we must be humble and painstaking searchers for the right word.

Common Words. Do not make the mistake of thinking that common words are too common. They will, of course, always express the bulk of your meaning. They are necessary and honest, direct, robust, and flavorsome. Shakespeare and the Bible glorify them. Franklin, Emerson, and Lincoln spoke a racy and eloquent speech of simple words. Say what you really think, not what you think you ought to say nor what another person or a book would say.

Pretentiousness. Call a spade a spade, even if you do not, as one writer says, refer to the dead man as "a corpse." There is nothing vulgar in referring to common things in common language. But it is vulgar, bad taste, to dress up one's language with a silly pretentiousness. There are some persons who never "go to bed"; they always "retire." They do not "get up" but "rise." Refreshments or lunch are with them a "collation," supper is dinner. According to their language nobody ever dies, but some do "pass on" or "go to their reward." If a man is drunk, he is said to be "intoxicated" or "under the influence of liquor." So squeamish are many that they cannot stomach the phrase, "I have drunk a glass of water." They prefer to say ungrammatically, "I have drank." This sort of thing is rarely found among writers and speakers of sound training. Others are saved by their native candor or sense of humor.

Macaulay, in his essay on Samuel Johnson, writes pointedly about this defect. He says:

Johnson, as Mr. Burke most justly observed, appears far greater in Boswell's books than in his own. His conversation appears to have been quite equal to his writings in matter, and far superior to them in manner. When he talked, he clothed his wit and his sense in forcible and natural expressions. As soon as he took his pen in his hand to write for the public, his style be-

came systematically vicious. All his books are written in a learned language, in a language which nobody hears from his mother or his nurse, in a language in which nobody ever quarrels, or drives bargains, or makes love, in a language in which nobody ever thinks. It is clear that Johnson himself did not think in the dialect in which he wrote. The expressions which first came to his tongue were simple, energetic, and picturesque. When he wrote for publication, he did his sentences out of English into Johnsonese. His letters from the Hebrides to Mrs. Thrale are the original of that work of which the Journey to the Hebrides is the translation; and it is amusing to compare the two versions. "When we were taken up stairs," he says in one of his letters, "a dirty fellow bounced out of the bed on which one of us was to lie." This incident is recorded in the Journey as follows: "Out of one of the beds on which we were to repose started up at our entrance, a man black as a Cyclops from the forge." Sometimes Johnson translated aloud. "The Rehearsal," he said, very unjustly, "has not wit enough to keep it sweet"; then, after a pause, "it has not vitality enough to preserve it from putrefaction."

Good Use. Violations of good taste and effectiveness in words may be profitably considered, but the young speaker is usually more concerned about the correctness of words. This is a question of good use, which requires that a word be in reputable use, in national use, and in present use. These tests call attention to the fact that language is not fixed for all time. English is not a dead language like Latin or ancient Greek. It is living, growing, changing, dying, rejuvenating. Words grow old and die. New ones take their places. Others lose their dignity and authority and sink to degraded uses. Words that have for centuries been the argot of the underworld gradually work their way into respectability.

Words from Foreign Languages. Our language draws upon almost every other language of the earth for enrichment. Besides the basic elements, Old English or Anglo-Saxon, French, Latin, and Greek, there is a very large vocabulary which we have imported with little or no change. *Boomerang* (Australian), *igloo* (Eskimo), *yacht* (Dutch), *algebra* (Arabic), *fez* (Turkish), *kindergarten* (German), *squaw* (N. A. Indian), *canary* (African), *silk, tea* (Chinese), *oasis* (Egyptian), *alphabet, cherub* (Hebrew), *brogue, shamrock* (Irish), *taboo* (Polynesian),

cigar, mosquito (Spanish), give some idea of its great variety. The war supplied us with thousands of new words. Improvements in transportation and communication have brought many more. Language must always be flexible enough to describe adequately the ever expanding life of its people.

Tests of Good Use. In these conditions of movement and change you may wonder how it is possible to keep up with every word's rating in the community of good use. Of course, the great bulk of language shows little change in the course of a lifetime. A good dictionary answers fully most questions. But there are always a great many words and usages which are too recent for dictionary makers to record. The final standard of all language is the usage of the majority of the best speakers and writers, not that of "purists" or professional men and women skilled in language. They may sometimes disagree with your dictionary, but you will find these cases comparatively rare. Occasionally it is difficult to determine whether a word is in reputable use or not. The more liberal or daring of the best speakers use it and give it a vogue. Others of a conservative disposition will not risk giving offense or endangering their reputations. They obey Pope's injunction:

> In words, as fashions, the same rule will hold,
> Alike fantastic, if too new or old:
> Be not the first by whom the new is tried,
> Nor yet the last to lay the old aside.

The young student, at least, ought to follow this advice. His departures from commonly approved usage will be attributed to ignorance rather than to daring or to advanced study.

Of Doubtful Repute. Colloquial English allows more latitude than written English. What is appropriate with some audiences or on some occasions may be out of place at other times. *Enthuse, suspicion* (for *suspect*), *photo, phone, burglarize, trolley* (for *trolley car*), *probe* (as a noun), *ad, vamp, peeved* are a few of hundreds of words commonly seen in the newspapers and familiar in speech that are clamoring for the approval of the best writers and speakers. Years ago William Cullen

Bryant made a list of words that he would not allow in the *New York Evening Post,* of which he was editor, and these words were taboo (as was *taboo*) in many other newspapers throughout the country. *Talented, reliable, collide, donate, leniency, humbug, aspirant, authoress, poetess, rowdies,* and *jeopardize* were among those condemned, but these and many others frowned upon have won their way to good use. In like manner, a large number of our present troublesome intruders will no doubt be eventually accepted. Brander Matthews's "Essays on English" is a very readable and illuminating book on this problem of correct and authoritative usage. It discusses principles of taste and applies them to favorite words in business, advertising, and newspaper English, all with a whimsicality and humor far removed from the usual academic treatment.

Slang. Slang is the largest class of words that cannot meet the test of reputable use. It is by no means to be wholly condemned. It is part of the humor, the adventure, the business, the hurly-burly of life. It is the picturesque, the comic, the brutal, the dramatic, struck off in a flash of insight. It is born in the slum, the college, the stable, the dance hall, the stock market, the field of sport, the shop, and the laboratory. Every occupation makes its own. Most of it, like the popular song, has its day and disappears. Slang occasionally supplies a word that has practically no equivalent in reputable English and that makes its way into good use because of its service. *Mob* and *cab* were eighteenth-century slang. They are abbreviated forms of *mobile vulgus* and *cabriolet. Movies* is the result of the same process, and although it was considered an impossible vulgarism only a little while ago, it has made its way into good use. *Bluff* is modern slang that has gained wide acceptance both here and in Europe. *Graft* and *jazz* have no adequate synonyms and have won respectability. These words seem to be genuine contributions. The same cannot be said of *pep,* which can be made more specific by *vim, vigor, energy, life, spirit, speed,* and other synonyms. But where is the synonym for *bootlegger, racketeer,* or *speakeasy?*

Perhaps everybody succumbs occasionally to slang. Teachers of English indulge in it often enough in their intimate talk. But they try to

discriminate in favor of the fresher and brighter kind that has the elements of genuine descriptive art. A new slang word is like a new story. Everybody is retailing it and it soon becomes a bore, repeated, like the old story, by the slow and the dull.

Slang, then, has the objections of other trite expressions and generalities with little definite content. *Dope* is the most horrible example cited by teachers. The college boy talks of *dope* as a drink, notes, miscellaneous information, advice, sporting news. He *dopes* out a plan or a story. His best friend may be a *dope.* Add *drip, jerk, stuff, hot, swell, Oh boy, How d'ye get that way? What's the big idea?* and you practically complete many a student's resources of description and emphasis. They save him the work of thinking and paralyze his speech growth. When he applies for employment he is almost as uncouth in language as if he had never had any training. Margaret Wentworth no doubt had him in mind in her amusing reproach, in *The Bookseller:*

> Take the subject of drama, for instance. We have the words, dear to the Muses and the poets, of *comedy, tragedy, melodrama, farce, opera, burlesque, musical comedy, operetta, revue* (or *review,* if you object to the foreign invasion), *circus, hippodrome, pantomime, masque, movies, talkies,* and *pageants.* And what word is employed indiscriminately for any or all of them? "Hello, Mame; want to go to a *show* to-night?"
>
> One might think the commoner verbs, at least, exempt. But take the case of *get,* which may be conjugated as follows:
>
> I *get* wise (become informed)
> Thou *gettest* hep (become informed)
> She *gets* him (marries him)
> We *get* you (understand your weird language)
> You *get* yours (receive chastisement of a mysterious nature)
> They *get* him (the invincible M.P.'s arrest their man)
> They *get* him (the gangsters murder a foe)

Practice. Good speech is a habit, the result only of constant, intelligent practice. Your skill is developed in your everyday conversation. You cannot rise to new heights on special occasions. You will merely stand convicted of glaring unpreparedness. So you will avoid slang in

spite of its prevalence and attraction, not because you are a prig, but because you are a practical businessman who can afford little dissipation.

Specific Words. Although you will spend much time in carefully examining and comparing words to be sure of their meaning and pronunciation, you must acquire something more than correctness. You speak to persuade, to induce action. After you have learned the rules of the game, you have still to become a good player. There must be confidence, dash, daring, color, and zest in your talk. This is not only a matter of right thinking, but of cultivated taste in the choice of pithy, plump, coaxing, condemning, inspiring, or driving words. This pursuit of the effective word is your real life's job.

In composing a speech you look for the illustration or example to make a detailed picture of your vague and indefinite general statement. Apply the same principle to your individual words and you become acquainted with the principal secret of interest and style. Be specific. Is it any wonder that reformers have so little success in saving a world that is weary of their futile repetitions of abstractions like *service, efficiency, uplift, revival, aftermath, shibboleth, propaganda, radical, red, reactionary,* and so on? We are largely influenced, to be sure, by phrases such as these. They appeal to the imagination, but because there are no clear images in them for the imagination to feed upon, they soon lose their original suggestion. Spencer, in his essay on style, shows us at once the superiority of the specific over the general by this little test in substitution. We should not, he says, talk like this:

> In proportion as the manners, customs, and amusements of a nation are cruel and barbarous, the regulations of their penal code will be severe.

He offers the following as more specific and consequently more vivid and eloquent:

> In proportion as men delight in battles, bull-fights and combats of gladiators, will they punish by hanging, burning and the rack.

Limit and Define. Just as you limit and define the subjects of your talks, you must condense and clarify your words. If you say, "John Smith lived in a *house,*" you do not tell us much. But if you say

he lived in a *cottage,* or a *bungalow,* or a *shack,* or a *manse,* or a *parsonage,* or a *palace,* you create not only a picture of the place but one of the man as well.[1]

" 'Go,' she said." The picture is faint. *Said* lacks description. Perhaps she *urged, screamed, pleaded, cried, murmured, sighed, exclaimed,* or *commanded.*

Of course if previous details in the context have already made a good picture, *said* may be just the right word—simple and direct.

We might continue the practice. When he went out of the room did he *steal* out, or *glide,* or *creep,* or *stumble,* or *swagger,* or *dash,* or *rush,* or *dance,* or *slouch,* or *shamble,* or *slip,* or *stride* out?

G. F. Hoar in his "Autobiography of Seventy Years" tells how Daniel Webster persistently sought the right word and tried out lists of synonyms even before his audience:

> He had a singular habit which made it wearisome to listen to his ordinary speech, of groping after the most suitable word, and trying one synonym after another, till he got that which suited him best: "Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that there has gathered, congregated, this great number of inhabitants, dwellers, here; that these roads, avenues, routes of travel, highways, converge, meet, come together, here? Is it not because we have here a sufficient, ample, safe, secure, convenient, commodious, port, harbor, haven?" Of course, when the speech came to be printed, all the synonyms but the best one would be left out.

History of Words. The more we know about words, as is the case with all other subjects, the more discriminating and enjoyable and enduring is our interest in them. Get acquainted with the history and pedigree of words. There is romance and fascination in words that have lived as long, traveled as far, and suffered as much as the Wandering Jew. There is more pleasure in "Words and Their Ways in English Speech," by Greenough and Kittredge, than there is in some modern novels. Even a casual study will help you to hear the rich overtones in the meanings of words. Their accumulated suggestions will not be entirely lost upon you. Prosaic business words will take on a freshness

[1] See Thomas and Howe, "Composition and Rhetoric," p. 177, Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., New York, 1918.

and an individuality that is robust, comic or grotesque, adventurous or brave.

A writer on salesmanship makes effective use of derivation to drive home a lesson:

Why do I say that the word *character* is bigger and better than either *individuality* or *personality,* you ask? Well, for one reason, because of its derivation. I always like to dig around the roots of a word until I uncover them. If you will do that you will find the greatest difference between *character* and *personality,* particularly. *Individuality* is a good, solid word. It is derived from *individual,* of course, and the root meaning of *individual* is, *not divisible,* the idea of oneness; human unit that cannot be broken up. . . .

But the word *personality* has an original meaning that, I must confess, has gone far to prejudice me somewhat against it. It comes from *person,* and *person* is a direct descendant of the Latin word, *persona,* which was the term used to designate the masks worn by ancient actors. And *persona,* in its turn, was built up from *per,* through, and *sonus,* sound.

The old Greek and Roman actors talked through their masks, in other words—and whenever I think of that, I automatically recall the more modern expression, "He talks through his hat." Consequently, when I hear too much about *personality,* I am inclined to think the salesman, or the lecturer or writer on salesmanship, is "talking through his hat." Likewise, I must confess to a deep-down conviction that all or most of this playing up one's personality is just so much talking through one's hat.

Anyway you look at it, though, how much more inspiring is the ancestry of that noble word, *character.* It comes from the Greek *charakter,* through the Latin word that is identical in spelling with the English—and *charakter* was derived from *charasso,* to engrave.

One's *character,* it follows, is that which is *engraved,* cut into the very tablet of one's being. Nothing could be more fundamental than that.

Charles Dyer Norton in an address to insurance men begins with a similar study of a word:

Have you ever looked into a dictionary to learn what the word "enthusiasm" really means and is? In the old Greek sense it is the visit of a god—Bacchus preferred. To be enthusiastic, is to permit the divine fire to flow through one's veins. It is an affair of the heart. The mind grasps certain facts;

reason draws certain conclusions and imagination binds them like fagots into a torch, and lights them with the fires of enthusiasm. In that genial glow the heart warms. Faith and hope revive. Energy takes command. The impossible becomes possible. Mortal men become heroes, and the work of the world is done.

There is, however, another phase of enthusiasm. John Bunyan, the peaceful conqueror, was an enthusiast, but so was the cruel inquisitor of Spain. Sir Philip Sidney was an enthusiast, but so was Captain Kidd. Enthusiasm for his art inspired Leonardo da Vinci, when he painted the Last Supper, at Milan, and the French soldiers destroyed it with equal fervor. Enthusiasm has lured bankers, honest and able bankers, to destruction. A wise and effective business man will not permit enthusiasm to constantly possess him. He will pass hours in careful study of facts. He will satisfy his judgment to the uttermost. He will give ample opportunity to others to do the same, and if the same facts fail to inspire others, he will examine them more closely and see whether his judgment has erred.

Businessmen know how to use the dictionary for clear and impressive talk. Stuyvesant Fish got the best part of his speech to the Louisville Board of Trade out of definitions that were available to everybody.

In order that we may clearly understand each other, permit me to define the word "economy." The Century Dictionary derives it from the Greek word *oikonomia,* which meant "the management of a household or family, or of the State, the public revenue"; and in turn derives *oikonomia* from two other Greek words *oikos,* a house, and *nomein,* to deal out, distribute, manage. Economy also means "the internal, and especially the pecuniary, management of any undertaking, corporation, State or the like"; and "the system of rules and regulations by which anything is managed"; and it is only latterly that the word has acquired the meaning of "thrifty and frugal housekeeping; management without loss or waste; frugality in expenditure; prudence and disposition to save."

Webster's dictionary gives the following synonyms:

Economy avoids all waste and extravagance, and applies money to the best advantage; *frugality* cuts off all indulgences, and proceeds on a system of rigid and habitual saving; *parsimony* is frugality carried to an extreme, involving meanness of spirit, and a sordid mode of living. Economy is a virtue and

parsimony a vice. Frugality may lean to one or the other, according to the motives from which it springs.

The sense in which I shall use the word *economy* is well defined in Edmund Burke's "Letters to a Noble Lord," written in 1796, where he says:

"It may be new to his Grace, but I beg leave to tell him that mere parsimony is not economy. It is separable in theory from it; and in fact may not be a part of economy, according to circumstances. Expense, and great expense, may be an essential part of true economy. If parsimony were to be considered as one of the kinds of that virtue, there is, however, another and higher economy. Economy is a distributive virtue, and consists, not in saving, but in selection. Parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no power of combination, no comparison, no judgment. Mere instinct, and that not an instinct of the noblest kind, may produce the false economy in perfection. The other economy has larger views. It demands a discriminatory judgment and a firm, sagacious mind. It shuts one door to imprudent importunity, only to open another, and a wider, to unpresuming merit."

Burke might have gone further and quoted from the Book of Proverbs: "There is that scattereth and yet increaseth."

Note the following derivations and look up those suggested in the exercises at the end of the chapter:

Panic—from the Greek *Pan,* the god of the country. Pan was said to cause sudden fright among the shepherds or wanderers in the woods.

Code—from the Latin *codex,* the trunk of a tree.

Book—from the Anglo-Saxon *boc* or beech tree; "library" is from a Latin word that means the bark of a tree.

Paper—from *papyrus,* the rushlike plant on the layers of which the ancient Egyptians first wrote.

Budget—from the Latin *bulga,* a bag. The budget was a large bag of money from which amounts were sorted into smaller bags for specific purposes.

Fee—from Anglo-Saxon *feogh,* cattle, once a principal means of making payment or fees.

Bank—from the Italian *banco,* bench. The first bankers or money-changers of Europe sat behind a bench on which was piled money from all countries.

Salary—from the Latin *salarium,* which means "salt money." This was given to the Roman soldiers for salt. In time the word was used to signify the whole of their pay.

Sincere—from the Latin *sine cera,* without wax. The carpenters and cabinetmakers of old Rome did not always make honest joinery. They sometimes used wax in fitting the parts. This dried in a little while and the chair or table fell apart. So furniture was advertised as *sine cera.*

Disaster—from the Latin *dis,* away, and *astrum,* star; away from one's (lucky) star. The Romans were very superstitious as well as practical.

Sinister—from the Latin *sinister,* left. Jupiter gave signs of evil or sinister portent, thunder, lightning, flights of birds, on the left. Left-handed persons were unlucky.

Dexterous—from the Latin *dexter,* right. Favorable omens occurred on the right. Right-handed persons were considered more skillful or dexterous in mind and body.

Enthusiasm—from the Greek *en,* in, and *theos,* god. Enthusiasm is literally the quality of being inspired, having God in one.

Villain—from the French *vilain,* serf or farm servant. Note how the reference to low birth is now changed to a description of low character.

Knave—from the German *knabe,* boy or servant boy. The nobleman frequently called his villains and knaves to task. He thought they were just as mean in character as in birth.

Saunter—Thoreau says it "is beautifully derived from idle people who roved about the country in the Middle Ages, and asked charity, under pretence of going *à la Sainte Terre,* to the Holy Land, till the children exclaimed, 'There goes a Saint-Terrer,' a Saunterer, a Holy-Lander."

Of course, words must be employed in their present use, not in their obsolete or archaic use, and you may think it confusing or time wasting to study the etymology of words. But the history of almost every word throws light on its present meaning and usually makes clear important and often unnoticed differences in synonyms. There is a practical benefit, too, in the liberal culture that comes from this survey of the progress of your race and its relations with the rest of the world.

Greek and Latin Derivations. You ought to be familiar with some of the more common Greek and Latin prefixes and roots that appear in so much of your everyday vocabulary. Remember that an unabridged dictionary like "Webster's New International" or "The New Standard" will tell you the whole story. We can list only a few examples here:

GREEK PREFIXES	GREEK DERIVATIVES
a (an), without, not	abyss (a + bottom), agnostic (a + know), apathy (a + feeling)
anti (ant), against	antidote (anti + give), antipodes (anti + foot), antiseptic (anti + decay)
auto, self	autograph (auto + write), automaton (auto + move), automobile (auto + move)
dia, through, across	diagram (dia + write), dialogue (dia + speak), diameter (dia + measure)
epi, on, upon	epidermis, (epi + skin), epidemic (epi + people)
eu (ev), good, well	eugenic (eu + race), eulogy (eu + speak), evangelist (eu + messenger)
homo, same	homogeneous, homonym
hetero, other	heterogeneous, heterodox
hyper, over, above	hyperbole, hypercritical
hypo, under	hypocrite, hypodermic
mono (mon), alone, single	monarchy, monotone, monopoly
pan, all	pandemonium, panorama, panacea
poly, many	polygamy, polyglot
syn (syl, sym), with	sympathy, synagogue
tele, far	telephone

GREEK ROOTS	
graph, write	telegraph
chron, time	chronology
dermis, skin	epidermis
demo, people	democracy
hydro, water	hydroplane
log, word	psychology
meter, measure	speedometer
path, feeling	pathetic, apathy
philo, friend	Anglophile, philosophy
phon, sound	phonetic, phonograph
scop, see	telescope, miscroscope
soph, wisdom	sophisticated, philosophy

LATIN PREFIXES	LATIN DERIVATIVES
a, ab, abs, away, from	absent, abduct
ad, to, toward	address, adhere

ante, before	antediluvian
anti, against	antagonist
circum, around	circumference, circumspect
con, together, with	confide, conference
de, from, down from	decline, degrade
e, ex, out of, former	exclude, excel
in, in	influx, immigrate
in, not	inanimate, immaculate
inter, intel, between, among	intercept, intelligence
intra, within	intramural, introduce
per, through, thorough	perennial, perfect
post, after	posterity, postscript
pre, before	preamble, precede
pro, before, for	proceed, project
re (red), back, again	recede, redeem
se, apart, aside	secede, segregate
sine, without	sinecure
sub, under	subject, suburb, suffer
super, above, over	superficial, superfluous
trans, across, beyond	transgress, translate

LATIN ROOTS

cedo, go	succeed, intercede
credo, believe	creditable, creed, credulous
dico, say	dictation, dictograph
duco, lead	induce, education
facio, make	deficient, factor
fero (latum), bear, carry	transfer, translate
flecto (flexum), bend	flexible, inflect
fluo, flow	superfluous, fluent
gradior, gressus, walk	egress, grade, graduate
jacio, jactum, throw	project, dejected
loquor, locutus, speak	elocution, loquacious
pendeo, hang	dependent, pendant
pono, positum, place	opponent, exposition
rumpo, ruptum, break	abrupt, interruption
scribo, scriptum, write	prescribe, description
specio, spectum, see	inspection, prospect
teneo, tentum, hold	tenement, content
venio, ventum, come	intervene, convention

Read Aloud. An easy and practical way to develop a consciousness and daring with words is to read them aloud, preferably, of course, to someone else. You cannot then slip lazily by a doubtful word. You must do something with it, pronounce it correctly or incorrectly, inflect it with a wrong or right meaning. The word simply forces you to give it your closest attention. Perhaps your listener can at once give you the needed information. If not, look it up in a small desk dictionary, or better still in an unabridged one, where the word is shown in illustrative sentences and the synonyms are more numerous. Read aloud from standard authors, whose exact and vivid and varied vocabulary will yield much larger results. This will form the habit of studying individual words. It is good psychology. Concentration, repetition, and association with other words of similar or identical meaning are all brought into play to help you memorize the new word and to encourage you in its familiar use.

In reading aloud, a valuable exercise for fluency is to substitute as many synonyms as you can for words that you are already fairly acquainted with. You will see at once that no two words, any more than two persons, are identical, and that so-called "synonyms" frequently differ a great deal. Your substitute will seldom have the force or precision of the word in the text, but the exercise will review and reinforce your vocabulary and will go a long way toward curing you of vague approximations.

Synonyms. This passage from George Bancroft may serve as an illustration:

The irresistible (*resistless, overpowering, overwhelming*) tendency (*inclination, leaning, set*) of the human race is to advancement, (*advance, progress*) for absolute (*arbitrary, unreserved, uncontrolled*) power (*force, authority*) has never yet succeeded (*prevailed*) and can never succeed in suppressing (*checking, subduing, destroying*) a single truth. An idea (*thought, impression*) once revealed (*disclosed, shown*) may find its admission (*admittance, entrance*) into every living breast (*bosom, heart, mind*) and live there. Like God, it becomes immortal (*undying, imperishable, everlasting*) and omnipresent (*universal*). The movement (*evolution, progress*) of the species (*race, mankind*) is upward, irresistibly (*invincibly*) upward.

The individual (*person*) is often lost (*destroyed, crushed, forfeited*); Providence (the *All-seeing*, the *All-giving*, the *Father*, the *Almighty, God*) never disowns (*disinherits, repudiates*) the race.

A good book of synonyms like George Crabb's "English Synonyms" or James C. Fernald's "Synonyms, Antonyms, and Prepositions" will acquaint you with the riches you have neglected while you were working a few poor tired words to death. You will find from fifteen to thirty synonyms or substitutes for some of them.

You can get from such books not only variety, but accuracy and discrimination in words that seem to mean very much the same thing. Here are two examples from Fernald:

> An *antagonist* is one who opposes and is opposed actively and with intensity of effort; an *opponent*, one in whom the attitude of resistance is the more prominent; a *competitor*, one who seeks the same object for which another is striving; *antagonists* in wrestling, *competitors* in business, *opponents* in debate may contend with no personal ill will; *rivals* in love, ambition, etc., rarely avoid inimical feeling.
>
> A dunce is always *averse* to study; a good student is *disinclined* to it when a fine morning tempts him out; he is *indisposed* to it in some hour of weariness.

The Dictionary. Learn to use an unabridged dictionary. It has thousands of good stories. History, biography, and drama are in it. You have seen how much there is to tell about the commonest words. The dictionary is the storehouse from which many interesting books on language have been compiled. Browning testified that he read a page or two of the dictionary every day and got entertainment and inspiration, as well as instruction, out of it. Everybody should at least make note of new words and look them up carefully to fix them in the mind and to put them to work in conversation.

Reading. Men who talk well read more, as a rule, than the average. Without conscious effort they absorb many ideas and the words that express them. Something of the style and taste of superior writers gets into their thought and speech. Reading is usually considered the most potent single factor in the enlargement of vocabulary.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. The following pairs of words are commonly confused or wrongly used as synonyms. Learn their correct usage and give a talk in which you compare their meanings and give sentences to illustrate. Several students may give reports, each confining himself to certain allotted words. Let the class discuss the words about which there is still question:

accept	except	uninterested	disinterested
aggravate	irritate	emigrate	immigrate
couple	two	person	party
affect	effect	fewer	less
farther	further	habit	custom
healthy	healthful	continual	continuous
illusion	allusion	ingenious	ingenuous
official	officious	lay	lie
recipe	receipt	liable	likely
balance	remainder	practical	practicable
expect	suspect	preventive	preventative
fix	repair	raise	rise
hung	hanged	transpire	happen
raise	rear	vocation	avocation
anxious	eager	while	although

II. Read George Herbert Palmer's "Self-cultivation in English." Make an outline of what you can tell best and report to the class. Read aloud a passage or two.

III. Study a passage from H. W. Fowler, "Modern English Usage," and try to make it interesting to the class.

IV. You will enjoy Richard Grant White on "The Use and Abuse of Words." Give a short talk on a chapter.

V. Select ten words from those discussed in a chapter of Greenough and Kittredge, "Words and Their Ways in English Speech." Explain and correct their common misuse.

VI. For a month or longer have at least one student at every meeting give a talk on words not already discussed in class. He will find abundant material in the above-mentioned books or in other reference books in the library.

VII. In an unabridged dictionary look up the derivations of the following words:

dollar	cash	milliner
bankrupt	finance	metropolis
fortune	politics	cereal

concord	colossal	idiot
macadam	education	idiom
mastodon	omnibus	pandemonium
boycott	capital	ignorant
cancel	curfew	intellect
cheat	lunatic	contemporary
pecuniary	sandwich	palace
atlas	tantalize	melancholy

VIII. Look up the complete derivations of the words listed in this chapter in the sections on Greek and Latin roots and prefixes.

IX. Give a lively talk on the derivation and meaning of six words chosen from any selection in this book. Poems may serve your purpose better than prose.

X. Speak on one of the following subjects:

1. The Cost of a Political Campaign
2. The Radio in Politics
3. The Mayor's Duties
4. Should Judges Be Elected by Popular Vote?
5. More Rigid Tests for Political Candidates
6. Women in Politics
7. Oil as an International Problem
8. Subsidies for Business
9. Evils of the Civil Service
10. Lobbies in Washington
11. Organized Minorities
12. Getting Out the Vote
13. The Initiative and Referendum
14. Problems in Alaska
15. Should Congress Have But One House?
16. Are Free Ports Desirable?
17. Group Insurance
18. Public Relations
19. The Progressive Party
20. Filibuster
21. DP's
22. The Pursuit of Happiness
23. Personal Efficiency
24. Crime Pays—on the Radio
25. The Numbers Racket
26. A Name in the News

27. The Automobile Show
28. What Do You Read?
29. Biological Warfare
30. Palestine

CHAPTER XIII

ENUNCIATION AND PRONUNCIATION

Men and women in business usually give enough thought to their personal appearance. Sometimes they show poor taste in dress, but they recognize the principle that good clothes kept neat and clean are an investment and not merely a display of vanity. A prosperous-looking person suggests ability and accomplishment—makes a favorable impression.

A Matter of Courtesy. What a pity to spoil this fine effect by opening the mouth in careless, slovenly, cheap enunciation. One can hardly take such a speaker seriously. Clipped and spotted words are disagreeable to everyone, even to those who are habitual offenders themselves. Words distinguish us from the dumb animals. They are the priceless treasure of thousands of years of effort on the part of man to understand himself and his fellows. We should regard them with some care and pride and dignity. To speak clearly and correctly is to speak courteously, and to fail in this requirement of good discourse is to be guilty of bad manners. Many university graduates with a string of degrees have neglected this fundamental of education and sound like crude, untrained men.

In Business. Nothing is more significant than the efforts businessmen everywhere are now making to train their employees in clean speech. They have waked up to the fact that any other kind is offensive to the prospective customer and drives thousands of dollars into the stores of more thoughtful and courteous competitors. Not long ago a writer in a popular magazine gave some striking examples. He told of meeting a young clerk who had just come from Ireland to try his fortunes in this country.

"Aren't you worried about getting employment?" asked the writer.

"Not at all," replied the young man confidently. "Here in America you don't train clerks to meet cultivated and discriminating buyers. On the other side every chap has to serve a strenuous apprenticeship in correct manners and speech." A few days later the young Irishman got a good place in a fashionable Fifth Avenue shop.

In our foreign trade, the writer continued, American corporations are employing well-spoken Englishmen to conduct their business in the larger European centers, much to the resentment of the many college graduates in the home offices. Americans would ordinarily be preferred because they are more familiar with the business, and, it is true, many of our own young men are doing well in Europe because they have the added qualifications of poise and attractive speech.

Bad Habits. No one, of course, would willingly handicap himself by a show of ignorance. Self-respect prompts the average person to do the best he can, but he is again the unconscious victim of bad habits. He assimilates in childhood a stock of incorrect forms and expressions that will handicap him for life unless he gives them his deliberate and persistent attention. He speaks them in spite of his knowing better. Here is the standard that Alexander Melville Bell sets up:

> Words should issue from the mouth as coins newly issued from the mint, deeply and accurately impressed, perfectly finished, neatly struck by the proper organs, sharp, distinct, in due succession and of due weight.

Need of Right Practice. When students become conscious of crudities or other shortcomings of utterance and take pains with their language, they often feel that their efforts toward correct speech sound strange and affected. That is because they are voluntary and labored. New articulations of teeth, tongue, and lips have to be learned. Vigilant and unremitting practice is necessary to make these contacts involuntary and effortless. New habits must replace the old. It is a common thing to check a student two or three times a minute for saying *atheletics* or *gotta, gonna, feller, doin'*, or *runnin'*. He will shamefacedly acknowledge his humiliation—and go right on repeating the same sin over and over, to the wicked enjoyment of the class and to his own discomfiture

and disgust. Habit is simply too much for him. But this "rubbing in" and "showing up" may be just what he needs to make him actively aware of his shortcomings. He will be his own critic and teacher in future conversation.

Do Not Be Overprecise. Good enunciation is not exaggerated or emphasized. It is not the painful thing you sometimes hear from the "finished" graduates of schools of elocution. It is the result of proper coordination of agility, flexibility, and precision in sounding the vowels and the consonants, the kind of speech one hears from educated people who have been reared in an environment of sound speech training.

Speech Environment. Imitation of good models is the quickest and surest way to good speech, but good models are comparatively rare. Even if conditions are ideal in the home, young people are greatly affected for the worse by the prevailing poor speech of the street, the school, the office, and the shop. Most students must relearn by taking thought, by studying and listening to their own language and to that of others. In conversation, in your classes, speak as well as you can. Associate as much as possible with those who know and practice the best enunciation.

This chapter can present only a few of the most common perversions and corruptions. They will serve to remind you of others that you ought to consider. Whenever you recognize a slackness of your own, repeat the correct form over and over until it sounds easy and natural. Some violations need only to be noted to be removed, others may need a few words of explanation.

Lazy Language. We all have a tendency to run words together. This is natural and occasionally allowable. We say *ladies'n gentlemen, bread'n butter,* and few object to this obscuring of the *and* because these phrases have become practically single words like *o'clock* and *will-o'-the-wisp.* Questions of this kind must be referred to the principle of good use, which is discussed in the chapter on vocabulary. But the tendency to take the easiest way often carries the careless to inexcusable extremes. Crushing and mushing words results in uncouth jargon like:

Wad d'yeh say?
How juh workkit?
I sawrim
The idearof it!
You betchu!
"J'eat?" "No, joo?"
I yam
G'wan
C'mon
Gimme yuh canno' beans.
Wazzat?
Gowafterim!
Sommice cream f'rus.
Christmasisscomin!
Pushon!

This is just (not *jis* or *jes*) laziness. Adjoining vowels are linked or consonants dropped because it requires a bit more attention or time to articulate them completely. So speech is gradually transformed into a slippery, mealy-mouthed, indistinct, and vulgar dialect. Of course, we cannot pause deliberately after every word. With a little practice we develop agility and a light touch that gives both accuracy and ease (not *an dease*). There are many phrases in which the words may be legitimately combined; such as *some men, fine night, deep pond, dear Rita, his step, mad dog*. But do not say *a-tall* for *at all, of core-swee* for *of course we*. A slight difference in stress and a slight checking of the breath between the words to be distinguished will correct most of this faulty articulation.

Dropped Syllables. Much the same kind of failure to enunciate firmly and fully is seen in the obscuring or dropping of letters and syllables within words, as in the following examples:

lib'ry	for lib-ra-ry
reelly	for re-al-ly
reelize	for re-al-ize
Feb'uary	for Feb-ru-ary
di'mond	for di-a-mond
reco'nize	for re-cog-nize
guv'-ment	for gov-ern-ment

Cath'lic	for Cath-o-lic
choc'-lit	for choc-o-late
c'lamity	for ca-lam-i-ty
batt'ry	for bat-ter-y
c'lateral	for col-lat-er-al
m'not'nous	for mo-not-o-nous
priv'-lij	for priv-i-lege
sa'sp'rilla	for sar-sa-pa-ril-la
fact'ry	for fac-to-ry
reg'lar	for reg-u-lar
iv'ry	for iv-o-ry

Vulgarisms. The following hardy outlaws are still much at large: *uv* (of), *fer* (for), *wuz* (was), *becuz* (because), *ellum* (elm), *fillum* (film), *Amurican* (American), *libity* (liberty), *innosuns* (innocence), *vurry* (very).

W and *Wh.* The sound of *wh,* as in *whip* and *where,* is commonly slighted. It is pronounced correctly as though it were *hw.* Say *hoo-wen.* Contract it to *h'wen, when.* Say *hoo-witch, h'witch, which.*

Say each of these sentences ten times, correctly and very precisely:

1. What wit! Walt Whitman.
2. When will he whistle?
3. With which winsome witch were you whispering?
4. At his willful whim the whip whizzed over the wheedling, whining whelp.
5. Well, when Will whiffed the wild wintry wind he whisked out his wicked whiskey.
6. Where was the white whale?
7. Where were we and why, we wondered.

Pronunciation: Conflicting Standards. Pronunciation is a matter of information rather than of habit. We are often in doubt about the syllable to be accented or about the quality of the vowel, whether it is, for instance, a long *a,* a short *a,* or neither. The parts of the English-speaking world differ considerably in their speech. Even aside from the dialects of England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland, Australia, and America, standard usage varies greatly. A speaker should not exploit Briticisms that are not in common use in this country, but what principle of usage may be applied to the several sections of the United States? What is standard

in the West is often quite different in the East. It is perhaps good sense to recognize and accept these differences. The dictionary supports the New Englander in his pronunciation of *ahnt* and *hahf,* but the Middle Westerner will probably always say *ănt* and *hăf.* His *ăunt* would think he was putting on airs if he called her *ahnt.*

Every locality has its peculiarities that are called provincialisms elsewhere, but if its best environment, that is, the majority of its skilled speakers, persists in using these forms, they become good use for that section. And if the group is large enough it will in time prevail over others and set up new standards, perhaps, for the whole country. So the West can afford to be complacent about its differences with dictionaries, which are written chiefly by provincial Easterners. And, after all, is it necessary that we all speak alike? There will always be conventions of pronunciation that no educated man can afford to neglect, but variation in minor matters we would not altogether suppress even if we could. There is a pleasure, a sense of adventure, in the unusual inflections and twists of speech that declare the speaker as coming from a far country. They add something not unattractive to his personality.

Italian *a*. Do not be satisfied with your pronunciation because it is like that of many worthy people. You may still be regarded as something of an ignoramus by those who know the correct form. In Boston, for instance, even among teachers, the broad *ä* is vulgarly overdone. You will hear *grahss, brahss, bahth, advahntage, lahst, dahnce,* spoken with great gusto and conviction. These words have not the broad Italian *ä* like the *a* in *father* or *calm*. Theirs is the short Italian *ȧ* like the *a* in *ask*. This does not mean anything to those who say *pahst* because they also say *ahsk*. This is worse than *ăsk* or *hăf* because it smacks of affectation. It is impossible to indicate on paper the correct pronunciation of this group. The short Italian *ȧ* is flatter than the broad Italian *ä,* but not so flat as the short *a* in *cat, hat, bat,* etc. This last *a* is comparatively thin, nasal, and at times almost snarling. It is not a musical tone. Singers avoid it. They make practically all *a's* broad because they are more tuneful. If you will think of the short Italian *ȧ* as the regular short *ă* with the squeak or the stridency or the nasality removed, you will speak

it correctly. Say, not *pahth* or *păth,* but *path,* halfway between the broad and the short.

aw as in *wall, awl:*

Do not say *dotter, wotter, tahk, becuz, ahlways, hotty, lah, caht.* Hold the *a* firmly forward at the lips and say *dawter, wawter, tawk, becaws, awlways, hawty, law, cawt.*

ā as in *grāte:*

ignorāmus	plāgue
nāked	pāthos

ē as in *seen:*

Do not say *slik* for *sleek.* Observe the same caution in *creek, clique, experience, period, imperial.*

ĭ as in *hĭll:*

Do not say *genuwine* for *genuine.*

docīle	civilīzation	Ītalian
respīte	hostīle	feminīne
heroīne	Cincinnatī	semī

Do not drop the *i* in words like *Latin.* Don't say, *mount'n, cap'n.* Give two complete syllables in the following: *Latin, captain, fountain, mountain, certain, satin.*

ŏ as in *nŏt, ŏn:*

Who has not heard *Jawn, mawd'n, dawl,* and *stawking?*

John	Tom	stocking
top	common	foreign
doll	orator	model
mock	majority	modern
clock	pocket	

o͞o as in *food:*

In New England, especially, *o͞o* is very often contracted to the *o͝o* of *good* or *wool.*

Give a long *o͞o* in:

room	root	coupon (not *kewpon*)
broom	noon	route
soon	sooth	bouquet
roof	tooth	

Long ō as in *hoe:*

The man from Ohio usually calls his state *Uh-hi-uh.* States' rights and common practice make this acceptable.

Keep up the long final ō in:

potatō	pillōw	mosquitō
pianō	tomatō	widōw
zerō	tobaccō	windōw
Torontō	tobascō	swallōw

ū as in *music:*

The long *u* is seldom correctly pronounced like *oo.* After r (*rude*), l (*blue*) and j (*jury*) the *o͞o* is correct, chiefly because *ū* is practically impossible to pronounce after these letters. In almost every other case you should give the *u* (*you*) sound. After some consonants this is easy and no difficulty arises. No one ever says, *moosic, foo* (few), *boogle* (bugle) or *Coopid* (Cupid). Indeed many insist on wrongly saying *kewpon* for *koopon* (coupon). After *d, n, s,* and *t* a little more attack and care are needed. Do not say, *noo, constitootion, stoodent, dooty.* The correct pronunciation of the long *ū* is a mark of expert, discriminating enunciation. Strike it accurately, but lightly. A hint will do. Do not fall into *jooty* or *juke* or *stee-udent.* Practice the following words and notice how good speakers pronounce them.

accūrate	dūke	manūfactūre
assūme	dūpe	new
avenūe	dūplex	newspaper
constitūtion	dūplicate	nūisance
dew	dūplicity	nūmeral
dūal	dūrable	nūcleus
dūbious	dūring	nūde
dūde	gūbernatorial	nūtrient
dūe	institūte	particūlar
dūet	institūtion	pictūre

prodūce	**sūper**	**Tūesday**
regūlar	**stūpid**	**tūmult**
stūdent	**sūperindūce**	**tūne**
stūdious	**sūpine**	
sūit	**tūbe**	

ou as in *round:*

Do not begin the diphthong with a flat *ă, ră-ound.* There is a clownish suggestion in *ă-out, tă-own,* that is fatal to dignity. Begin with the broad Italian *ä* like that in *father.* Say, *rah-ound, sah-ound,* and condense it to *ow,* as in *owl:*

how	cowl	round	fowl	hound	house
doubt	count	sound	howl	town	oust
vowel	bound	found	growl	ground	county

Consonants. Consonants demand energetic use of the tongue and jaws. They must be attacked alertly and accurately, but not ponderously. Overemphasis is as bad as carelessness.

picture	(not *pitcher*)
literature	(not *literachoor*)
fortune	(not *forchin*)
individual	(not *indivijual*)
education	(not *ejucation*)
little old New York	(not *lil ol' N' York*)
elm	(not *ellum*)
fifths	(not *fif's*)
kept	(not *kep'*)
recognize	(not *reco'nize*)
and	(not *an'*)
question	(not *queshon*)
clothes	(not *clo's*)
insists	(not *insis'*)
costs	(not *cos'*)
asked	(not *ask'*)
government	(not *guv'ment*)
cartridge	(not *ca'tridge*)
writing	(not *writin'*)
brethren	(not *breth'n*)
brand-new	(not *brannoo*)

A volume would be required to classify all the common violations of good enunciation, which is chiefly a matter of clear, distinct utterance. Dialectic difficulties, heedlessness, ignorance, and indifference combine to make the standard of enunciation in this country very low. But the public speaker cannot hope to find in this fact excuse for his own inefficiency. Audiences place a high value on the easy mastery of good articulation just because of its comparative rarity. They doubt the education of those who neglect this fundamental of good speech.

Accentuation. *Pronunciation* is commonly violated by misplaced accent. This is of course easily remedied by a little study, and once the speaker learns the correct pronunciation of a word he seldom offends in the same way a second time. If he does, he is always conscious of doubt and usually takes the trouble to assure himself of the facts because his pride is enlisted. A misplaced accent is like a sore thumb—it is much more noticeable than indistinctness or slovenly enunciation, although the cumulative effect of the latter is much worse.

Use of the Dictionary. A good dictionary is positively essential in this study. And equally important is a familiar and complete knowledge of its use. Comparatively few students understand what they read in a dictionary. Most pay little attention to accents, and less to diacritical marks. They copy the data from the dictionary—or omit the very item about which there is doubt—and still cannot pronounce the word.

The dictionary gives good practice in accurate observation. Why do you look up a word? If you are in doubt about its pronunciation, it is, as a rule, only one syllable that troubles you. At least you are almost certain it must be pronounced this way or that. Everybody hits upon the same syllable and asks the same questions about *ague, acumen, avoirdupois, connoisseur, egregious, imbroglio, nomenclature, magazine, Penelope, vaudeville.* And then almost everybody who is not familiar with the dictionary proceeds to verify his guess. He fails to get the answer to his leading query and probably overlooks other details equally vital.

Definition of Accent. English accent is more perplexing than French or German. Accent is the stress or stroke that gives a greater distinctness

or loudness to certain syllables. "Webster's New International Dictionary" says:

There are various degrees of accent, only two of which need to be marked. There are the *primary* as in *in-stead'*, where the full force of the voice is on the last syllable; and the *secondary*, as in *su'per-in-tend'*, where the first syllable has a stress greater than that laid on the second and third syllables, but less than that laid on the last. In some words two subordinate accents are shown, as in *in com'pre-hen'si-bil'i-ty*. . . .

Many in America give a marked secondary accent in certain words which properly have but one accent, and that on a syllable preceding the penult (next to the last syllable) as in *ter'ri-to'ry, cir'cum-stanc'es, in'ter-est'ing*, etc. This fault may be corrected by giving the accented syllable a sharp percussion, which carries the voice lightly through the rest of the word.

British Compared with American Accent. Not merely "many," but probably most, Americans have the "fault" noted above by Webster. It is one of the characteristic differences between American and British speech and may have to be accepted as correct American usage.

The British pronounce *military* as *mil'i-t'ry*. Americans say *mil'i-ter'ry*. *Extraordinarily* becomes in like manner *ex-trôr'd'n-r'ly* and *ex-trôr'di-ner'ri-ly*. The "sharp percussion which carries the voice lightly through the rest of the word" does it so lightly that some of the syllables are partly or wholly dropped. Try to say *in'ter-ẹst-ing* with a single accent and you will find it difficult to achieve anything better than *in't'rest-ing*, three syllables instead of four. This violation of dictionary (*dic'-tion-ry* or *dic'tion-er'ry?*) usage is as bad as the American false secondary accent. Most skilled speakers seem to prefer the former horn of the dilemma, however, and for this reason students should learn to recognize uncalled-for secondary accents and to avoid them. All the syllables can be vocalized, after a little careful practice.

Recessive Accent. There are no fixed rules for English accent, but there is one general principle which is worth remembering. Webster says:

English accent is recessive; that is, the general tendency of the language is to carry the chief accent back toward or to the first syllable. The working of

this principle is seen in such words as *bal′-co-ny*, formerly *bal-co′ny; con′fis-cate, v.*, formerly, and still by some, *con-fis′cate*, etc. Often the struggle between this principle and former usage is reflected in varying present usage, as in *ad′ver-tise* and *ad-ver-tise′*, *il′lus-trate* and *il-lus′trate*, etc.

Almost everybody recognizes this tendency, for it causes doubt and confusion about many words. When this book first appeared, the following words were accented, according to Webster, on the second syllable, and no other accent was allowed as correct. Today you may accent either the first or the second syllable, with perfect propriety.

abdomen	occult
acclimate	precedence
address	pretense
adept	recess
adult	refutable
ally	research
aspirant	resource
defect	retail
detail	robust
detour	romance
finance	trousseau
inquiry	

The Reverse. But there is also a contrary (*con′trar y* or *con trar′y?*) spirit that reverses this tendency and insists on accenting the second syllable instead of the correct first. Accenting the second syllable of the following words was considered, less than a generation ago, as illiterate. Today it is as proper as accenting the first. You can't go wrong.

applicable	harass
chastisement	obligatory
construe	overt
conversant	primarily
despicable	syringe
disputant	traverse

Still Accented on the Second Syllable. Here are a few of the words not yet made of doubtful pronunciation by the tendency to recessive accent:

ca lor′ ic	mu se′ um
clan des′ tine	re cline′
cog no′ men	re me′ di able
con do′ lence	rou tine′
do main′	va ga′ ry
gri mace′	

Back to the First Syllable. Another group of common words suffers incorrect accent on the second syllable. Accent these on the first syllable:

ad′ mirable	eq′ uipage	main′ tenance
a′ lias	ex′ igency	ob′ durate
com′ parable	for′ midable	or′ chestra
ab′ ject	gon′ dola	prĕc′ e dent (noun)
ad′ versary	hos′ pitable	pref′ erable
brig′ and	im′ pĭous	rap′ ĭne
com′ batant	in′ famous	rep′ utable
com′ promise	in′ fluence	rĕs′ pĭte
dec′ ade	in′ terested	the′ ater
def′ icit	in′ teresting	trib′ une
des′ ultory	lam′ entable	vē′ hement

Notice that some words are accented on the first syllable when they function as nouns, and on the second when they are verbs.

Noun	Verb	Noun	Verb
ac′ cent	ac cent′	prod′ uce	pro duce′
an′ nex	an nex′	prog′ ress	pro gress′
con′ flict	con flict′	proj′ ect	pro ject′
con′ tent	con tent′	pro′ test	pro test′
con′ test	con test′	re′ tail	re tail′
con′ trast	con trast′	sub′ ject	sub ject′
per′ mit	per mit′	sur′ vey	sur vey′

Words of Two Correct Pronunciations. When a word has more than one accepted pronunciation, choose the more common usage. *Ad-ver′tiz-ment* is more literary, but *ad-ver-tize′-ment* is preferred by businessmen generally. Although *eether* or *eye-ther* is correct, we cannot agree with the verdict of the Irish professor that *ayther* will do. The pronunciation *eether* is much more common in this country and should

be preferred to *eye-ther,* which sounds affected to most hearers. When two pronunciations seem equally common, no problem is presented. Apply the principle to the following list:

aggrandizement
alternate
aspirant
brusque
brooch
canteloupe
chivalric
confiscate
contemplate
debut
decorous
demonstrate
envelope
extant
illustrate
infantile
juvenile
mama
mercantile
misconstrue
papa
patriot
pianist
prestige
quinine
reptile
route

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Practice the following sentences until the correct enunciation and pronunciation are habitual and effortless.

1. What did you say to the fellow in the wheel chair?
2. I'm going to get a newspaper for him.
3. Get some ice cream for us (not *sommice cream f'rus*).
4. He kept his hat on during the entire performance.
5. The inspector's duty was to go through the factory at regular intervals.
6. Where will you find the equal of Walt Whitman?
7. Go to the library for *The Saturday Review of Literature.*
8. I recognized him in spite of his new hat.
9. We are going to the moving pictures in the Municipal Building.
10. His father insists that his new suit of clothes costs too much.
11. He asked if liberty was encouraged by the government.
12. I am (not *I yam*) not in favor of cutting down the old elm (not *theeyold ellum*).
13. Literature gives us vivid pictures of nature.
14. Modern methods are not always brand new.
15. Running and jumping, and singing a stupid tune, he made his way to the potato patch.
16. He was not particular about making accurate reports.
17. Push on! (not *pushon*) There is water just ahead.
18. His daughter was going to New York to study law.
19. Give me a quart of milk.
20. The student helped to manufacture the new tube on Tuesday.
21. I had to (not *hadduh*) get four apples for her.
22. I saw him take one whiff of the cold air and whisk back into the house.
23. The idea of his going to ask for the position!
24. Because of the length of his history lesson, he had no time to memorize his poem.
25. He did his Latin with his fountain pen.
26. The cruel government brought ruin to all.
27. Where are (not *wearuh*) my gloves? They're up (not *therrup*) on the shelf
28. I've got to go now. I want to hear his lecture on "Old English."
29. There's really just one picture that everyone will recognize.
30. The government clerks walked and talked on their way to the diamond.
31. Many of them saw him as he went out on the lawn.
32. What would have become of them!

33. He ought to be sure it's just the right thing to do.
34. What do you think of that?
35. America and her allies had to fight for freedom.
36. That's the question that really troubles him.
37. Just which one he want , I don't know
38. Rich gifts wax poor when givers prove unkind.
39. He made inquiry about the vaudeville show in the new theater.
40. He had a lamentable ignorance of American literature
41. My weak words have struck but thus much show of fire.
42. Thou wouldst not play false yet wouldst wrongly win.

II. The following passage from Southey's "The Cataract of Lodore" cures many students of the habit of dropping the *g* in the words that end in *ing* The selection is almost ideal for practice in energetic attack, distinctness, and precision. It makes unusual demands on breath support and voice production.

> Delaying and straying and playing and spraying,
> Advancing and prancing and glancing and dancing,
> Recoiling, turmoiling and toiling and boiling,
> And gleaming and streaming and steaming and beaming,
> And rushing and flushing and brushing and gushing,
> And flapping and rapping and clapping and slapping,
> And curling and whirling and purling and twirling,
> And thumping and plumping and bumping, and jumping,
> And dashing and flashing and splashing and clashing,
> And so never ending, but always descending,
> Sounds and motions forever and ever are blending,
> All at once and all o'er, with a mighty uproar,
> And this way the water comes down at Lodore.

III. For improving pronunciation and enlarging vocabulary there is no better practice than reading aloud passages from the best authors Give adequate study to the unfamiliar words before you read the following selections to your listeners:

1. Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you, trippingly on the tongue; but if you mouth it, as many of your players do, I had as lief the town-crier spoke my lines Nor do not saw the air too much with your hand, thus, but use all gently, for in the very torrent, tempest, and, as I may say, whirlwind of your passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness O, it offends me to the soul to hear a robustious periwig pated fellow tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the ears of the groundlings, who for the most part are

capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb-shows and noise. I would have such a fellow whipped for o'erdoing Termagant. It out-herods Herod. Pray you, avoid it.

Be not too tame neither, but let your own discretion be your tutor. Suit the action to the word, the word to the action; with this special observance, that you o'erstep not the modesty of nature. For any thing so overdone is from the purpose of playing, whose end, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as't were, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure. Now this overdone, or come tardy off, though it make the unskillful laugh, can not but make the judicious grieve; the censure of the which one must in your allowance o'erweigh a whole theatre of others. O, there be players that I have seen play, and heard others praise, and that highly, not to speak it profanely, that, neither having the accent of Christians nor the gait of Christian, pagan, nor man, have so strutted and bellowed that I have thought some of nature's journeymen had made men and not made them well, they imitated humanity so abominably.

SHAKESPEARE, "Hamlet."

2. One of the carronades of the battery, a twenty-four pounder, had got loose. This is perhaps the most formidable of ocean accidents. Nothing more terrible can happen to a vessel in open sea and under full sail.

A gun that breaks its moorings becomes suddenly some indescribable supernatural beast. It is a machine which transforms itself into a monster. This mass turns upon its wheels, has the rapid movements of a billiard-ball; rolls with the rolling, pitches with the pitching; goes, comes, pauses, seems to meditate; resumes its course, rushes along the ship from end to end like an arrow, circles about, springs aside, evades, rears, breaks, kills, exterminates. It is a battering-ram which assaults a wall at its own caprice. Moreover, the battering-ram is metal, the wall wood. It is the entrance of matter into liberty. One might say that this eternal slave avenges itself. It seems as if the power of evil hidden in what we call inanimate objects finds a vent and bursts suddenly out. It has an air of having lost patience, of seeking some fierce, obscure retribution; nothing more inexorable than this rage of the inanimate. The mad mass has the bounds of a panther, the weight of the elephant, the agility of the mouse, the obstinacy of the ass, the unexpectedness of the surge, the rapidity of lightning, the deafness of the tomb. It weighs ten thousand pounds, and it rebounds like a child's ball. Its flight is a wild whirl abruptly cut at right angles. What is to be done? How to end this? A tempest ceases, a cyclone passes, a wind falls, a broken mast is replaced, a leak is stopped, a fire dies out, but how to control this enormous brute of bronze? In what way can one attack it?

You can make a mastiff hear reason, astound a bull, fascinate a boa, frighten a

tiger, soften a lion; but there is no resource with that monster—a cannon let loose. You cannot kill it—it is dead; at the same time it lives. It lives with a sinister life bestowed on it by infinity.

VICTOR HUGO, "Ninety-Three."

3. To impoverish the colonies in general, and in particular to arrest the noble course of their marine enterprises, would be a more easy task. I freely confess it. We have shown a disposition to a system of this kind; a disposition even to continue the restraint after the offense; looking on ourselves as rivals to our colonies, and persuaded that, of course, we must gain all that they shall lose. Much mischief we may certainly do. The power inadequate to all other things is often more than sufficient for this. I do not look on the direct and immediate power of the colonies to resist our violence as very formidable. In this, however, I may be mistaken. But when I consider that we have colonies for no purpose but to be serviceable to us, it seems to my poor understanding a little preposterous to make them unserviceable in order to keep them obedient. It is, in truth, nothing more than the old and, as I thought, exploded problem of tyranny, which proposes to beggar its subjects into submission. But remember, when you have completed your system of impoverishment, that nature still proceeds in her ordinary course; and that discontent will increase with misery; and that there are critical moments in the fortunes of all states when they who are too weak to contribute to your prosperity may be strong enough to complete your ruin. *Spoliatis arma supersunt.* The temper and character which prevail in our colonies are, I am afraid, unalterable by any human art. We cannot, I fear, falsify the pedigree of this fierce people and persuade them that they are not sprung from a nation in whose veins the blood of freedom circulates. The language in which they would hear you tell them this tale would detect the disposition; your speech would betray you. An Englishman is the unfittest person on earth to argue another Englishman into slavery.

EDMUND BURKE, "Speech on Conciliation."

4. There is a strong feeling in favour of cowardly and prudential proverbs. The sentiments of a man while he is full of ardour and hope are to be received, it is supposed, with some qualification. But when the same person has ignominiously failed and begins to eat up his words, he should be listened to like an oracle. Most of our pocket wisdom is conceived for the use of mediocre people, to discourage them from ambitious attempts, and generally console them in their mediocrity. And since mediocre people constitute the bulk of humanity, this is no doubt very properly so. But it does not follow that the one sort of proposition is any less true than the other, or that Icarus is not to be more praised, and perhaps more envied,

than Mr. Samuel Budgett the Successful Merchant. The one is dead, to be sure, while the other is still in his counting-house counting out his money; and doubtless this is a consideration But we have, on the other hand, some bold and magnanimous sayings common to high races and natures, which set forth the advantage of the losing side, and proclaim it better to be a dead lion than a living dog. It is difficult to fancy how the mediocrities reconcile such sayings with their proverbs According to the latter, every lad who goes to sea is an egregious ass, never to forget your umbrella through a long life would seem a higher and wiser flight of achievement than to go smiling to the stake, and so long as you are a bit of a coward and inflexible in money matters, you fulfil the whole duty of man.

ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON, "Crabbed Age and Youth."

5. An Austrian army, awfully arrayed,
Boldly by battery besiege Belgrade,
Cossack commanders cannonading come,
Deal devastation's dire destructive doom;
Ev'ry endeavor engineers essay,
For fame, for freedom, fight, fierce, furious fray.
Gen'rals 'gainst gen'rals grapple,—gracious God!
How honors Heav'n heroic hardihood!
Infuriate, indiscriminate in ill,
Just Jesus, instant innocence instill!
Kinsmen kill kinsmen, kindred kindred kill.
Labor low levels longest, loftiest lines,
Men march 'midst mounds, motes, mountains, murd'rous mines.
Now noisy, noxious numbers notice nought,
Of outward obstacles o'ercoming ought,
Poor patriots perish, persecution's pest!
Quite quiet Quakers "Quarter, quarter" quest;
Reason returns, religion, right, redounds,
Suwarrow stop such sanguinary sounds!
Truce to thee, Turkey, terror to thy train!
Unwise, unjust, unmerciful Ukraine!
Vanish vile vengeance, vanish victory vain!
Why wish we warfare? wherefore welcome won
Xerxes, Xantippus, Xavier, Xenophon?
Yield, ye young Yaghier yeomen, yield your yell!
Zimmerman's, Zoroaster's, Zeno's zeal
Again attract; arts against arms appeal.

All, all ambitious aims, avaunt, away!
Et caetera, et caetera, et caeterà.

ANONYMOUS,
"Alliteration, or the Siege of Belgrade."
From BARTLETT'S "Familiar Quotations."

IV. Give a short talk on one of the following topics:

1. Hitting the Ceiling
2. Never Complain, Never Explain
3. We Need to Be Needed
4. Skating
5. Gardening
6. Gadgets
7. Mental Hygiene
8. If
9. Travel Posters
10. Pilot and Copilot
11. Dog Racing
12. Automobile Racing
13. Penthouse
14. Olympic Champion
15. Learning the Hard Way
16. Railroading
17. Bankruptcy
18. Puppy Food
19. Custer's Last Stand
20. Movie Bandits
21. The Little Theater
22. The Corn Belt
23. Shade Grown
24. High-test
25. Unfettered by Obligations
26. Earthquakes
27. Yugoslavia
28. State Fair
29. Concentration Camps
30. Horseshoes

CHAPTER XIV

THE SPEAKING VOICE

The quality of a salesman's voice frequently sells more goods than his arguments. There is no conviction in dull, listless tones or nasal, squeaky, growling, or throaty utterance. "The voice is the man," says Paul Heyse, and it is the man we judge before we are interested in his goods. Voice without words is eloquent. You may hear strange voices some distance away. You cannot see the faces or distinguish the voices. But you may still get specific or vivid impressions of the speakers. You are sure they are cheerful or depressed, triumphant or angry, weak or strong, irritable or good-natured, querulous or calm, affected or sincere. Some of them you instinctively like, others you dislike. You unconsciously judge the character of a man, in large measure, by his voice.

The American Voice. In Europe tone and enunciation are class distinctions. Europeans never tire of telling what poor voices Americans have. They object to the nasal, nervous, highpitched tones of our women and the colorless or crude, uncultured voices of the men. They think we sound like well-fed savages and not like cultivated citizens of a great country. This criticism may be prompted in part by a rather common supercilious and patronizing attitude, but it has enough truth in it to teach us a valuable lesson. There is probably, on the whole, more poor voice in Europe than there is here. Poverty, ignorance, and misery produce it, but the upper classes, through inheritance, environment, and deliberate thought about the significance of good voice quality, are distinguished by more attractive and musical modulations.

Pride in Speech. The fact is, we are just becoming conscious of the influence of voice. We are just emerging from a pioneer stage in which as a nation we had little pride in speech. We have heard our noble Eng-

lish language corrupted and degraded by hundreds of dialects and the "pigeon" English of millions of immigrants as well as by our own indifference. Popular education is doing little so far in attacking this problem, but the great interest shown everywhere in the study of oral English is a most encouraging sign of a widespread desire for a genuine culture. Perhaps the most important test of education is the ability to speak one's language well, and, in the future, college degrees will have comparatively little social value to those who fail to meet this requirement.

Organic Differences. We usually overlook the fact that we can train and improve the speaking voice just as we do the singing voice. Indeed they are the same thing, and the same principles of development are applied to both. To be sure, no two voices are alike. We are born with certain conditions that cannot be changed. In this respect we are like so many violins or flutes or cornets. These differ in fundamental *timbre, Klang-Farbe,* or tone color according to their size and the shape and texture of their materials. The Stradivarius has an initial superiority over other violins. Caruso is said to have had longer vocal cords, larger lungs, deeper chest, larger teeth, roomier resonance chambers in the head and mouth than the vast majority of human beings. Here are the differences we cannot overcome, but this is only half the story. Caruso would not have been a great singer if he had not assiduously cultivated his voice. Between his early singing and that of his prime there was almost as much difference as that between the wild rose and the garden rose. The Stradivarius in the hands of a poor player will not give us the pleasure of a mediocre instrument in the hands of a master.

Then, too, the difference in the fundamental tone may not be one that implies better or worse. We hear many fine speakers and singers. Each has a different appeal and voice quality, but we may enjoy one as much as another. This distinctiveness gives us an individuality that we ought to prize. It is the thing that identifies us more than our clothes or our personal appearance. We readily distinguish the voices of our acquaintances over the telephone or in the next room. Our voices reflect

us, and with this thought goes the comforting fact that practically every voice can be made agreeable and persuasive.

Good Health. The most obvious requirement of good voice is good health. The voice is sensitive and expressive of the condition of the body. When a man is sick his voice is thinner and weaker; when he is well it is correspondingly more robust and colorful. Farmers, sailors, and all outdoor workers have generally a mellower, richer fundamental tone. Constrictions or disease of the lungs, throat, mouth, or nose prevent the making of satisfactory tone. Many persons handicap themselves all their lives by neglecting serious defects that could be removed by a simple bit of surgery.

Breathing. Breath is the raw material of tone. You inhale and fill the porous sponge-like lungs, which then press down upon the diaphragm, the rather tough, elastic muscle that is the floor of the chest and the roof of the abdomen. The diaphragm arches up somewhat like a dome, and in deep breathing the lungs flatten and harden it. When you exhale, the diaphragm rises back to its original position and helps to force the air out of the lungs. The breath goes up the windpipe over the vocal cords, where the vibrations produce the initial tones.

Place your fingers just under the ribs, in front, and notice how the walls of your stomach press out and fall back with the action of the diaphragm. Observe a sleeping cat or dog or baby and you will see a very pronounced rhythmic action.

Lie on your back, breathe easily, place your hand on your stomach, and you will feel the same rise and fall. Nature has made us, in this position, proof against lazy, shallow breathing. Sit up, focus your breathing at the stomach and see if you are getting the same effect. Do not allow the chest or the shoulders to rise. The distention should be felt at the lower ribs and around the waist line.

Women, especially, because of tight clothing sometimes get the habit of only half filling the lungs. Men, too, become careless because of cramped positions at desks or too little physical alertness. This kind of breathing will sustain life after a fashion, although the lack of fresh

air in the lower lungs frequently causes decay and is a prime cause of lung and throat diseases. But it is inadequate for good speaking whether in conversation or on the platform. Tone is affected vitally by the volume and force of the air column that vibrates the chords.

If the breathing is shallow and spasmodic the tone will be thin and breathy. The breath is too quickly exhausted. The lungs and diaphragm may be thought of as a bellows. If the bellows is leaky or wheezy, the tone cannot be full and round. Or you may compare the diaphragm to the spring of your phonograph or the pistons of your engine. Notice the deep chests and deep breathing of singers. They practice breathing to sustain the long phrases of song which astonish us. The notes are prolonged with firmness. No quavering must mar them. This is done by inhaling quickly and exhaling slowly. You must get the habit of holding back the breath, easily, however, and without a feeling of effort or distress. The bellows must release the breath out very gradually. No more breath should be expended in making a tone than is necessary. Hold a lighted candle three or four inches from your mouth and see if you can talk in ordinary conversational tone without blowing it out.

This deep controlled breathing for speech can usually be gained only by practice and by thinking about it. The following exercises are simple and can be done at any time.

EXERCISES

1. Stand easily erect and place the hands under the ribs, the finger tips touching in front and the thumbs extended toward the back. Inhale gently, but deeply. As the lungs fill, you can feel the walls of the stomach pressing out. You will be conscious of an expansion and fullness all along the waist line.

2. Inhale for about five seconds and exhale slowly on *s-s-s-s,* the sound of escaping steam. The teeth are closed for this exercise and help to keep back the breath.

3. Inhale as before. Exhale on the sound of *ah.* Conserve the breath. Begin softly and make the tone as free from guttural or throaty harshness as possible. After a little practice you should be able to prolong the *ah* without a quaver for half a minute.

4. Try the same exercise with *oh, ōō, ē* at different pitch levels.

Volume. There is no excuse for a healthy person's speaking in tones that cannot be heard. Take a deep breath and expel it on *uh-uh-uh-uh-uh* (like the *u* in *but*). Aim at the farthest wall or a distant tree with these brisk expulsions. Next, instead of *uh-uh,* exhale on, "I call to you with all my voice." Lift up the voice easily, without shouting or yelling. Prolong the vowels and let them ring. With the diaphragm working energetically and the tone coming apparently from the stomach instead of the throat, there is little temptation to constrict the muscles in and around the voice box. Think the tone at the lips, or try to hit the back of the upper teeth. Release the breath from the waist over the vocal cords into the head and mouth. It seems almost easier now to expand the breath on a full round ringing phrase than to subdue it to a more casual or softer or thinner tone. Give the following passages in a kind of prolonged chant and yet with enough vigor and variety of inflection to indicate their complete meaning. Try the shorter ones on a single breath.

Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more;
Or close the wall up with our English dead!
In peace there's nothing so becomes a man
As modest stillness and humility;
But when the blast of war blows in our ears,
Then imitate the action of the tiger;
Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood,
Disguise fair nature with hard-favour'd rage;

. . . .

Now set the teeth and stretch the nostril wide,
Hold hard the breath, and bend up every spirit
To his full height! On, on, you noblest English.

. . . .

Follow your spirit; and upon this charge
Cry, "God for Harry! England and St. George"!

SHAKESPEARE, "Henry V."

I impeach Warren Hastings, Esquire, of high crimes and misdemeanors.
I impeach him in the name of the Commons of Great Britain, in Parliament assembled, whose parliamentary trust he has betrayed.

I impeach him in the name of all the Commons of Great Britain, whose national character he has dishonored.

I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose laws, rights and liberties he has subverted, whose property he has destroyed, whose country he has laid waste and desolate.

I impeach him in the name, and by virtue, of those eternal laws of justice which he has violated.

I impeach him in the name of human nature itself, which he has cruelly outraged, injured and oppressed, in both sexes, in every age, rank, situation and condition of life.

EDMUND BURKE, "Impeachment of Warren Hastings."

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in.

Psalm xxiv, 7.

Hang out our banner on the outward walls;
The cry is still, "They come"!

"Macbeth."

A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!

"King Richard III."

O, that this too, too solid flesh would melt.

"Hamlet."

Roll on, thou deep and dark blue ocean, roll.

BYRON, "Childe Harold."

Sail on! and on! and on!

JOAQUIN MILLER, "Columbus."

If such there breathe, go, mark him well!

SCOTT, "Lay of the Last Minstrel."

Try to speak this sentence on one breath:

There is not, throughout the world, a friend of liberty who has not dropped his head when he has heard that Lafayette is no more.

EVERETT, "Eulogy on Lafayette."

Phrasing. This last exercise is exhausting. It is a good test for deep and controlled breathing, but should never be given this way before an audience. There should always be ample breath in reserve. Breathe often, at natural pauses and through the mouth as well as the nose. You cannot breathe quickly enough through the nose alone. Of course, in ordinary life breathing, keep the mouth closed. Try the sentence from Everett again and pause for quick, deep breath through the mouth after "world" and after "head," and note how much easier and firmer, less hurried and more authoritative, the enunciation is.

Try the following sentence on one breath:

> It was seventeen years after our parting on the Wawona ridge that I stood beside his grave under a pine tree on the hill above Sleepy Hollow.
>
> MUIR, "Our National Parks."

This, too, is difficult. Pause for breath after "ridge" and after "grave" and notice the saving in effort and the increase in force. Another pause after "tree" would not violate the sense. If you felt the breath too nearly spent, you might pause, without serious loss of meaning, after "parting."

Breath Control. Well-sustained breath support is the first requirement of mellow and authoritative utterance. Remember, however, that too much breath is as bad as not enough. The excessive breathing that gives a strangling or bursting feeling is injurious to the lungs and makes impossible the almost effortless control by which the breath must be conserved in speech and which should become practically as automatic and instinctive as ordinary breathing. For better health get the habit of breathing deeply and gently; and for better voice, of frequently expelling the breath through the closed teeth or through the closed lips. Puffing the cheeks is good for the face and will make for better vibration and resonance of the teeth and mouth.

Endurance. An hour's talk requires the same kind of strategy as a ten-mile foot race. The rate of speed for almost the whole distance must be comfortable, deliberate, and sustained by deep breathing. You may

rush through a five-minute talk, perhaps, without great fatigue, but much of the tone will be breathy, thin, and monotonous because the bellows is collapsing too rapidly, and the tone must be made by what little breath there is in the mouth and by a tiring and irritating contraction of the throat muscles.

Relaxation. The second important step in voice production is the relaxing of the muscles of the mouth and throat. Correct breathing helps to take the attention away from the vocal cords and partly solves the difficulty. Think of voice as starting from the waist. Sore throat, hoarseness, dryness, fatigue, and almost all roughness in the voice come from gripping and contracting the throat muscles. The college yell is about the worst thing for the delicate tissues. The sharp bark is so irritating that it frequently leaves the student sick all over. The loud or querulous or argumentative or hurried tone is almost as bad because it involves strain. Relax, surrender. The lower jaw is usually too stiff. Let your head fall forward until your chin almost touches your chest. With blank, half-closed eyes shake the head gently from side to side. Open your mouth and let the jaw hang loosely during this exercise. Let it swing heavily, almost as the hand does from the wrist.

Yawn-n-n! Stretch and try it again. As the yawn breaks, say, "Ah, ah, I know." Notice how cool and mellow and comfortable the tone is. Look into the mirror as you yawn and notice how the throat opens. The soft palate with its triangular pendant, the uvula, rises away from the tongue and gives the breath a better chance to make good tone in the mouth and head.

Control Your Tongue. The velvety texture of the mouth and throat must be disturbed as little as possible. The tongue has long been called an unruly member and is so in an added sense. The back of the tongue is joined to the swallowing muscles, and unnecessary movement causes these to pull and to interfere with the sensitive tissue around the vocal cords. When the tongue is not active in the making of consonants and words, it should lie flat and still in the mouth, the tip just touching the bottom of the lower teeth. Words, then, should not be made too precisely. The tongue should make contacts neatly, quickly,

and lightly, stressing consonants just enough to make words distinctly and correctly, but making no waste effort that will only cause further tension in the throat.

Prolong the Vowels. Immediate improvement often results from prolonging, almost singing, the vowels. The tone carries farther and is more musical. The outdoor speaker, if he is wise, practically chants his speech. The clipped and more rapid enunciation of ordinary conversation cannot be heard. Indoors, too, the speaker will never be exhorted to speak "louder," if he remembers that besides adequate breath support he needs the singing or prolonged word. It can be heard much farther and is much more eloquent than mere loudness or noise. Loudness overwhelms but is still indistinct and raucous or shrill in quality.

The newsboy and the huckster would not last long if they shouted or yelled their wares. They chant them:

Glo-o-o-be, Hera-a-a-ld, Telegra-a-am. Stra-a-awberrēēs, bana-a-an-as, mĕ-ĕlo-ons.

Their enunciation and pronunciation are often vile, but they can call off their lists all day without fatigue.

In conversation we naturally should not prolong vowels with exaggerated effect, but we must prolong them more than most speakers do if we wish sympathetic and impressive utterance. Rapid or staccato enunciation is liable to be thin, monotonous, and unimpressive. Of course, in prolonging words there is danger of dawdling, of lifelessness, of artificiality. But conscious and studious listening to yourself and to others will help you to get a natural and pleasant speech melody that has also vigor and variety.

EXERCISES

Stop swallowing and chewing words. Do not squeeze them out with the throat muscles. Let the diaphragm push up the tone easily. Say "hah," like a sigh, with a strong downward inflection. Say without effort, letting the words float upon the breath:

Half a league, half a league onward.

Open your mouth, take a good gulp of air and say sympathetically and cheerfully:

1. A-a-ah, swee-eet is Tipperary in the springtime of the year!
2. Oh, the calm and the charm of the farm!
3. Over the sea and far away.
4. Grow old along with me.

Breathe deeply and expel the breath in a gentle, comfortable laugh:

Hah, hah, hah, hah, hah, hah, hah!

Always think the tone well forward at the lips. Move the lips vigorously in these exercises:

Oo-wuh, oo-wuh, oo-wuh. Yah-hoo, yah-hoo, yah-hoo. Ee-yaw, ee-yaw, ee-yaw. Mee-yow, mee-yow, mee-yow. Moo-oo-oo! moo-oo-oo! moo-oo-oo!

Resonance. Consciousness of the open throat will be gained more easily when considered in connection with the third great principle of voice—that of resonance. What is it that amplifies and beautifies the tone of your phonograph or radio? The loud-speaker. Detach this and the tone is thin and squeaky. The head is the loud-speaker for the voice. The initial or fundamental tone made at the vocal cords is enriched by the overtones, the vibrations in the mouth and nasal chambers. Use your head. The cavities in it make the mellow, resonant, singing voice. Surgeons have experimented with headless bodies by pumping air through the lungs over the vocal cords. The result proved what they expected. There was only a faint murmur or buzz. Resonance is the most important quality of the singing or speaking voice. Think of tone as a fountain that spurts from the diaphragm to the bridge of the nose and descends through the nostrils.

Obstructions to Pure Tone. What we call a "nasal tone" is really not nasal at all. It is caused by a constriction in the nostrils. Pinch the nostrils and talk. The disagreeable twang is very pronounced. Diseased cartilage, growths, or a twisted septum may obstruct the free passage of the breath or offer a soft, spongy resistance that makes a muffled or otherwise impure tone. The ringing, singing tones are made by vibrations against the hard, bony structure of the chest, the teeth, and the head. Diseased tonsils, adenoids, and other grows are not only handicaps to the health

in general, but especially so to the voice. If you have difficulty in breathing or have any other trouble with the nose or throat, consult a specialist. It may be a slight operation that stands between you and greatly increased vitality and greatly improved tone.

Nasality. Sometimes nasality is acquired from an environment, just as people acquire accents or learn a foreign language. It is an imitative process. The New England twang is of this sort. Its origin may have been in the climate and the outdoor farm life, but today it is chiefly the product of successive generations who have grown up with the sound and regard it as normal and correct.

A sense of awareness and thoughtful listening to distinguish the various speech "tunes" will do much to eliminate nasality. Exercises for resonance will help to bring the tone forward and reduce the back-throated twang. Nasality is often caused by letting the soft palate drop on the back of the tongue and allowing all tone to get up into the nasal passage instead of restricting the opening to the nasal consonants *m, n,* and *ng.*

Say *ung-ah.* Look into a mirror and notice how the soft palate drops on *ung* and rises on *ah.* Your problem may be to keep the soft palate raised as much as possible. Do this by speaking phrases or sentences that have no nasal consonants, such as "Stay for his lecture." Speak the sentence. Then pinch the nostrils and say it again. Do you detect nasality? If so, do the exercise once more and try to lessen the nasal quality. Make up other sentences without *m, n,* or *ng* and continue your efforts to reduce nasality.

Exclamations and dramatic speaking help to eliminate the twang. They raise the soft palate and get the tone out at the teeth. Attack these lines with plenty of vigor.

1. A horse! a horse! my kingdom for a horse!
2. On your marks! Ready! Go!
3. Gentlemen may cry peace, peace!—but there is no peace. The war has actually begun!

Placing the Tone. Your exercises for resonance are attempts to place the tone in the head. There is, of course, no stream of tone that you

can direct. There are only vibrations. But you can think a tone in the head just as you think of breath and tone starting near the stomach. It is only "thinking makes it so" in all the variety of modulation that the voice achieves in song or speech. So we sometimes speak of aiming our words at the bridge of the nose or the back of the upper teeth. Some combinations of vowels and consonants are easier for this purpose than others.

EXERCISES

A hum, for instance, is the purest sound you can make. It is breath made tone with the least resistance. The mouth and throat enjoy perfect relaxation. Hum softly into the head. If you detect nasality try it softer still. You are expending too much breath. On a comfortable pitch level hum *m-m-m-m*. Feel the vibrations under the upper lip and in the nose. Fill the head with vibrations and then open the lips a little on *m-m-ee*. *ee* is made well forward at the lips and will not disturb the vocal set. After some practice with *me* for resonance and relaxation, try *moo*, another good lip combination. Then proceed to *maw* and *ma*, the next easiest. *Boom*, you will see at once, is a fine word. "Boo-oo-m-m! boo-oo-m-m! boo-oo-m-m! the great gun roa-oared!" Hear that roar! Let it swell up into the head and boom resonantly out at the lips.

N is even better than *m* for head resonance, especially in the ending *ng*. Try *ung, ung, ung, bung, rung, sung, lung*. One teacher of singing likes this phrase: "nine unknown men in Maine." Chant the words on one level and run them together: *nine-nunknown-men-nin-Maine*. *Nay* aimed at the upper teeth helps some students to a sense of head tone. Caruso, it is said, used to try out his voice before his entrance by walking back and forth intoning *feesh, feesh, feesh*. The *f* and *sh* as well as the *ee* are made forward at the lips with a minimum disturbance of the throat and tongue muscles, and there is just enough checking of the breath to make a good breathing exercise. If you understand the principle, you can find or make up many other useful words and phrases.

How Emotion Affects Voice. The technical or mechanical method of voice improvement often requires the supervision of a teacher until the student learns to do the exercises efficiently. There is a more interesting and more practical way to work with or without an instructor. The effect of the emotions on the body is well known. Men have always whistled to keep up their courage. William James tells us that

we can shake off depression by getting up, walking about, and singing a cheerful song. Go through the motions of cheerfulness, and you will soon be actually cheerful. Try the reverse if you are curious. Slump down in your chair in a dejected attitude. Hold your head in your hands, think of something dismal, and you will soon have a self-induced but genuine and engulfing gloom. The psychologists have proved by hundreds of scientifically conducted experiments that the buoyant, uplifting emotions like love, joy, happiness, optimism, admiration; the sensations of grandeur, sublimity, power, and service are tonic—wholesome stimulants that actually promote the well-being of the body. They improve the circulation of the blood and aid digestion. Fear, on the other hand, and its variants, anger, irritability, worry, nervousness, haste, and depression, have a correspondingly opposite effect. They poison the system and lower the vitality and often cause serious illness. Doctors make practical studies of the temperaments of their patients and use every means of suggestion for encouraging emotions of satisfaction and pleasure. Christian Science, Coué's auto-suggestion, and other methods of mental healing all owe their success to the expansion of these basic concepts.

Interpretation. The voice reacts almost immediately to this treatment. We recognize the habitually cheerful man by his clear open tones, and the chronically timid or nervous or worrying person by his negative, muffled, subdued, thin, strained, or piercing voice. James points the way to a sound method of practice in his theory of imitation of emotion. By reading aloud, feeling and interpreting hopeful and courageous, sublime, vigorous, and altruistic literature, we create in ourselves the moods that involuntarily bring about deep breathing, relaxed throat muscles, and the resonance of noble expression. But emotion is the result of meaning, of accurate and sympathetic understanding of the passage to be rendered. Coué furnishes us now a revealing hint. He says that the remarkable cures of suggestion are the result, not of the will, but of the imagination. See concretely and vividly the thing you wish or are trying to do. Put yourself in the author's place, get into his frame of mind, make his images, pictures, clear to yourself. You must not

only know the meaning of his words, but their overtones, their implied and emotional values. Brood over the passage, live it and finally read it to a present or to an imaginary audience. Read it like an authoritative interpreter who thoroughly enjoys the privilege of explaining and translating a great friend.

Poetry Is Practical. Poetry is much better than prose for this purpose. It is not only more stirring, more highly charged, but its language is essentially musical and beautiful. When you can read Shakespeare you have trained your voice. You express his heartiness, boldness, ease, authority, tenderness, and wisdom in words and phrases that are almost everywhere ideally adapted to the work of voice improvement. It is significant that we have today scarcely any actors who can play Shakespeare. Voices and the desire for study are lacking. The easiest way is to trade on a flashy or superficially attractive personality. The commonplace and often cheap dialogue makes no demands upon the performer. An occasional splendid, ringing, magical voice still delights audiences and is possessed almost without exception by one of the older school that had ample experience in Shakespeare and other poetic drama. You do not want to be an actor or a reader, but you do want a voice easily responsive, confident and sympathetic, and capable of expressing as large a vocabulary of modulations as of words.

Orotund Quality. First, practice for good, round, orotund quality. Lyric poems of slow movement serve the purpose well. Reflective, deliberative sentiment, touched with a gentle melancholy, helps to open the throat and stimulates deeper breathing. The more sustained, higher pitched poems of praise or joy are equally useful.

Try the following passage from Tennyson. Notice the prolonged rhythm of the first two lines. See and hear those dark, slow, heaving, ponderously breaking waves. Suggest them in *brea-eak, brea-eak, brea-eak.* Every word in these two lines is a single syllable and each is ideal for practice in tone placing. The next two lines have chiefly short vowels and should be read somewhat faster. Speak the third line in one breath and the fourth in another; then try to speak both on a single exhalation.

Get the atmosphere and the mood of the poem. Understanding and feeling must be fused in a kind of "pleasurable melancholy." Read with pulsations and rhythm that suggest the smooth, effortless, but long and steady swell of the ocean. Avoid the short and choppy:

Break, break, break,
  On thy cold gray stones, O Sea!
And I would that my tongue could utter
  The thoughts that arise in me.

O well for the fisherman's boy,
  That he shouts with his sister at play!
O well for the sailor lad,
  That he sings in his boat on the bay!

And the stately ships go on
  To their haven under the hill;
But O for the touch of a vanish'd hand,
  And the sound of a voice that is still!

Break, break, break,
  At the foot of thy crags, O Sea!
But the tender grace of a day that is dead
  Will never come back to me.

Tennyson wrote "Crossing the Bar" not long before his death. Get the spirit of calm, beauty, fullness, and depth that pervades the poem. Give it pause, dignity, impressiveness and golden, resonant tone.

Sunset and evening star,
  And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
  When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
  Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
  Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
    And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell
    When I embark;

For tho' from out our bourne of Time and Place
    The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
    When I have crossed the bar.

The following lines are spoken by Macbeth just after the death of his wife and just before his own death in the battle which he is awaiting, and which he knows will be the end of his mad career. Give the first line slowly, and suggest the infinite, monotonous, wearying existence that Macbeth contemplates. Let philosophy and chastening disillusion speak in relaxed and swelling tones. Courage and dignity remain, though hope is gone.

To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

In the following passage from Julius Caesar, Marullus, a partisan of the now dead Pompey, upbraids the mob for its fickleness in shifting its uproarious adulation so quickly to the conquering Caesar. Give it heartily, buoyantly, in good, round vigorous denunciation, sarcasm, and command. It is good practice for breathing, resonance, and volume.

You blocks, you stones, you worse than senseless things!
O you hard hearts, you cruel men of Rome,
Knew you not Pompey? Many a time and oft

Have you climb'd up to walls and battlements,
To towers and windows, yea to chimney-tops,
Your infants in your arms, and there have sat
The livelong day with patient expectation
To see great Pompey pass the streets of Rome:
And when you saw his chariot but appear,
Have you not made an universal shout,
That Tiber trembled underneath her banks
To hear the replication of your sounds
Made in her concave shores?
And do you now put on your best attire?
And do you now cull out a holiday?
And do you now strew flowers in his way
That comes in triumph over Pompey's blood?
Be gone!
Run to your houses, fall upon your knees,
Pray to the gods to intermit the plague
That needs must light on this ingratitude.

Wolfe read Gray's "Elegy" the night before he attacked Quebec and remarked to his officers that he would rather be the author of these lines than the victor in the impending battle for the possession of Canada. Read them as if you knew why:

The boast of heraldry, the pomp of pow'r,
    And all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave,
Awaits alike th' inevitable hour.
    The paths of glory lead but to the grave.

Poe's "The Bells" is a remarkable performance in combining effective imitation of the tones of several kinds of bells with an appropriate mood and sentiment for each. Try to support him adequately by reading with discrimination for sound and sense:

Hear the sledges with the bells—
Silver bells—
What a world of merriment their melody foretells!
How they tinkle, tinkle, tinkle,

In the icy air of night!
While the stars that oversprinkle
All the heavens seem to twinkle
With a crystalline delight;
Keeping time, time, time,
In a sort of Runic rhyme,
To the tintinnabulation that so musically wells
From the bells, bells, bells, bells,
Bells, bells, bells,—
From the jingling and the tinkling of the bells.

Hear the mellow wedding-bells—
Golden bells!
What a world of happiness their harmony foretells!
Through the balmy air of night
How they ring out their delight!
From the molten-golden notes,
And all in tune,
What a liquid ditty floats
To the turtle-dove that listens, while she gloats
On the moon!
Oh, from out the sounding cells,
What a gush of euphony voluminously wells!
How it swells!
How it dwells.
On the Future! How it tells
Of the rapture that impels
To the swinging and the ringing
Of the bells, bells, bells,
Of the bells, bells, bells, bells,
Bells, bells, bells—
To the rhyming and the chiming of the bells!

Hear the tolling of the bells—
Iron bells!
What a world of solemn thought their monody compels!
In the silence of the night,

How we shiver with affright
At the melancholy menace of their tone:
For every sound that floats
From the rust within their throats
Is a groan.
And the people—Ah, the people,
They that dwell up in the steeple,
All alone,
And who, tolling, tolling, tolling,
In that muffled monotone,
Feel a glory, in so rolling
On the human heart a stone.

The Four Elements. In every sound there are, in addition to the element of quality just discussed, the elements of force, time, and pitch. These add the necessary meaning and variety. Many speakers have good quality in voice but still sound dull and monotonous. Many speakers, on the other hand, have mediocre, even poor quality, but use their heads to hold attention by alert, intelligent control of the other three elements.

Force. Force implies confidence, a positive attack. There must be volume, but a loud, unvaried force is disagreeable, tiresome. You wouldn't think of shouting steadily in conversation. The mood, the idea, the emphasis, and the stress are revealed in a natural flexibility that subdues as well as heightens force. Good speakers have a quiet, reserved force that indicates clearly enough that they can let go with the big tones when the moment is fitting. They underscore the significant words and speak with an air of authority and experience. They have the force of conviction.

Pitch. Some speakers have an unsatisfactory pitch level. Their voices are constantly pitched too high. The cause may be nervousness, insecurity, or overeagerness to make a point. A rapid rate of speaking often raises the pitch level disagreeably. You have noticed how the voice goes up when a phonograph record is played fast and how it goes down when the record revolves slowly.

If your voice is naturally high-pitched, do not try to force it down your throat to make it sound as if it came out of your stomach. This will produce only a strained and husky tone. The constant tensing of the vocal chords will rob them of their elasticity and seriously limit the range of inflections.

Comfortable breathing and a relaxed, more deliberate rate of speaking will bring down the voice level. Reading aloud solemn, sorrowful, or sublime, slow-paced passages of prose and poetry will induce lower tones.

When the pitch level is characteristically too low, inaudible, and lifeless, the remedy is practice in reading aloud passages of colorful, dramatic animation that require higher and varied pitch levels. Dialogue, questions, and comparisons and contrasts encourage upstrokes, change, and daring, and help the subdued speaker to get "out of the mud." He should also take advantage of the natural and appropriate changes in pitch levels that indicate transitions from one topic to another, from a light to a serious mood, from a point of view to something different.

Inflection. The element of pitch includes inflection—the strokes upon words and phrases that reveal their full meaning, the shading that completes the picture of a thought. We have a large vocabulary of modulation which supplements our vocabulary of words. The voice of the interesting speaker always tells us a great deal more than the same words in print. We can fall into bad habits of inflection just as we may neglect proper enunciation. An old business associate meets you on the street. He growls, "Good morning!" Your experience with him assures you that he means well and that he is in really good temper at the moment, that he is only speaking in his usual muffled, throaty tone of which he is not at all conscious. A stranger, however, would undoubtedly get the implication "Go to the devil!" and would ignore the actual words "Good morning."

Conventional Modulations. We often reprove ourselves for our apparently unreasoning dislikes for certain persons. We have to admit that these persons seem well disposed, intelligent, and good-natured.

If we analyze our feeling and try to account for it, we sometimes find the cause in the disliked one's voice. We find that while his words are satisfactory, we are irritated by something in his tones that is inconsistent with them. He depresses or irritates us with the brisk, cheerful words: "And how are you today?" or "Good-by" or "Hope you had a pleasant time" or "How is your family?" or "Pleased to meet you." He intends to show friendly interest, but we cannot help feeling that he has no genuine interest and that he is only using the words to get rid of us as soon as possible.

Of course, society uses a great deal of polite camouflage that does not deceive or offend. It is a necessary lubricant and we do not expect others to live up always to the spirit of their words. But we do expect a thoughtful and sincere note instead of the absent-mindedness that characterizes so much speech.

Unresponsiveness. Most of us are not so absent-minded or uninterested as we seem. Our voices do not register because we have not exercised them any more than we have the rest of our bodies, perhaps, or our minds. We have slumped into a narrow compass of inflection, and lack of use has made our voices cramped and comparatively unresponsive. But the chief difficulty is the lack of interested, active, and purposeful thinking. An active mind will certainly make an active voice, and right here there is consolation for those who have not the appealing natural voices that some have. The best voice in the world will make a poor speech, one that will not be listened to long, unless it is supplemented by a wealth of stimulating inflection created by the energy and conviction of an alert mind. Speakers often look and sound as if they were talking in their sleep. They need a physical shaking to wake them up. Take heart from the many good speakers who are working under a handicap of slight physique and comparatively thin voices. They hold their audiences by distinct, clean-cut enunciation, by speaking up and by fine discrimination in modulation. They are conscious workmen. They know what they are trying to do and are quick to see what they are actually doing. They do not drone, nor are they satisfied with half an effect when a subtle bit of shading will give twice as

much meaning. They pause before a new topic or go to another pitch level. Mere emotional atmosphere or tone color is not enough for them. They know that is too vague, unsupported by definite reason and detail, to produce action. They get interest for individual words and ideas by pointing them, by giving them inflections of satire, humor, pathos, cheerfulness, doubt, explanation, toleration, or conviction. Their applications of force, time, and pitch, as well as of quality or tone color, provide a running comment and interpretation. This is intelligence genuinely at work—"on the job." Its attitude is: "Do you understand me, do you believe me and will you work with me?" not, "I'm getting along all right" or, "What shall I say next?"

Time. The rate of speaking is naturally important. In public speaking it should range from deliberate to moderately paced. "A fast talker" may be slang for someone smart, but on the platform he suggests a lack of confidence. He is also monotonous because he does not take time for variety in quality, force, pitch, and inflection.

Rapid speech impairs clear and correct articulation. The long vowels in words like *home, room, creek* are skimped. Letters and whole syllables are dropped or neglected. The speaker leaves a wake of mangled or half-formed words like *unnerstan', reelize, becuz, libidy, gen'lem'n, reg'lar, ackerate, jis', lib'ry, reco'nize,* and *brannoo.*

Pause. Many speakers are successful because they know the values of pause and dare to make effective stops. The use of pause is often the actor's chief device for getting and holding attention. He knows that all spontaneous talk has a broken rhythm. In studying his lines he speculates about phrase units and pauses. He pays little attention to marks of punctuation. They are meant for the eye, not the ear, and there are many more pauses than are indicated by print. How would this person say this sentence naturally and yet effectively? How can I get everything out of this line without making it sound artificial or "hammy"?

The problem of the public speaker is not so difficult, because he is expressing himself. But "Be yourself" is not a safe guide. You are many selves and on the platform you are likely to be a less favorable one until

you have acquired a new poise. The rate is liable to be hurried and too regular. The speaker is afraid to make the pauses that count so heavily.

Practice. Read the following selections to a real or to an imaginary audience. Study the general moods or sentiments and the words and phrases that make them plausible and convincing. Meaning comes before emotion or reaction. Make a selection clear in all its parts and you can hardly help giving the right emotional color. Some of the poems, like "Abou Ben Adhem," should be read slowly. Practice in the use of pause will add much to the beauty and impressiveness of the interpretation. Most students read everything too fast.

The speaker who lacks abandon, color, and variety will find "The Congo," by Vachel Lindsay, a valuable selection. The author's notes in the margin give interesting directions for reading it. Only the first few lines may be quoted here.[1]

Fat black bucks in a wine-barrel room,
Barrel-house kings, with feet unstable,
Sagged and reeled and pounded on the table, *A deep rolling bass.*
Pounded on the table,
Beat an empty barrel with the handle of a broom,
Hard as they were able,
Boom, boom, BOOM,
With a silk umbrella and the handle of a broom,
Boomlay, boomlay, boomlay, BOOM.
THEN I had religion, THEN I had a vision.
I could not turn from their revel in derision.
THEN I SAW THE CONGO, CREEPING THROUGH THE BLACK,
More deliberate.
CUTTING THROUGH THE JUNGLE WITH A GOLDEN TRACK.
Solemnly chanted.

. . . .

Then I heard the boom of the blood-lust song
And a thigh-bone beating on a tin-pan gong. *A rapidly piling climax of speed and racket.*

. . . .

[1] By permission of the publishers, The Macmillan Company, New York, from Vachel Lindsay, "The Congo and Other Poems."

Steal all the cattle,
Rattle-rattle, rattle-rattle,
Bing!
Boomlay, boomlay, boomlay, BOOM,
A roaring, epic, rag-time tune . . .

From VACHEL LINDSAY, "The Congo."

Ah God, for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by,
One still, strong man in a blatant land.
Whatever they call him, what care I,
Aristocrat, democrat, autocrat—one
Who can rule, and dare not lie!

TENNYSON, "The Prayer."

HAMLET (*takes up the skull of Yorick, the King's jester*): Alas, poor Yorick! I knew him, Horatio; a fellow of infinite jest, of most excellent fancy. He hath borne me on his back a thousand times. And now how abhorred in my imagination it is! My gorge rises at it. Here hung those lips that I have kissed I know not how oft. Where be your gibes now, your gambols, your songs, your flashes of merriment, that were wont to set the table on a roar? Not one now, to mock your own grinning? Quite chopfallen? Now get you to my lady's chamber, and tell her, let her paint an inch thick, to this favour she must come. Make her laugh at that.

SHAKESPEARE, "Hamlet."

Ah, sweet is Tipperary in the springtime of the year,
When mists are rising from the lea,
When the Golden Vale is smiling with a beauty all beguiling,
And the Suir goes crooning to the sea;
And the shadows and the showers only multiply the flowers
That the lavish hand of May will fling;
Where, in unfrequented ways, fairy music softly plays—
Ah, sweet is Tipperary in the Spring!

DENIS A. MCCARTHY, "Tipperary in the Spring."

Remember March, the ides of March remember;
Did not great Julius bleed for justice' sake?

What villain touch'd his body, that did stab,
And not for justice? What, shall one of us,
That struck the foremost man of all this world
But for supporting robbers, shall we now
Contaminate our fingers with base bribes,
And sell the mighty space of our large honors
For so much trash as may be grasped thus?
I had rather be a dog, and bay the moon,
Than such a Roman.

SHAKESPEARE, "Julius Caesar."

And now before the open door—
The warrior-priest had ordered so—
The enlisting trumpet's sudden roar
Rang through the chapel, o'er and o'er,
Its long reverberating blow,
So loud and clear, it seemed the ear
Of dusty Death must wake and hear.
And there the startling drum and fife
Fired the living with fiercer life;
While overhead, with wild increase,
Forgetting its ancient toll of peace,
The great bell swung as ne'er before:
It seemed as it would never cease;
And every word its ardor flung
From off its jubilant iron tongue
Was, "WAR! WAR! WAR!"

T. BUCHANAN READ, "The Rising."

And did those feet in ancient time
Walk upon England's mountain green?
And was the holy Lamb of God
On England's pleasant pastures seen?

And did the countenance divine
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here
Among these dark Satanic mills?

Bring me my bow of burning gold!
Bring me my arrows of desire!
Bring me my spear; O clouds, unfold!
Bring me my chariot of fire!

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.

WILLIAM BLAKE, "Jerusalem."

Abou Ben Adhem (may his tribe increase!)
Awoke one night from a deep dream of peace,
And saw, within the moonlight in his room,
Making it rich, and like a lily in bloom,
An angel writing in a book of gold;
Exceeding peace had made Ben Adhem bold,
And to the presence in the room he said,
"What writest thou?" The vision raised its head,
And with a look made of all sweet accord,
Answered, "The names of those who love the Lord."

"And is mine one?" said Abou. "Nay, not so."
Replied the angel. Abou spoke more low
But cheerily still; and said, "I pray thee, then,
Write me as one that loves his fellow-men."

The angel wrote and vanished. The next night
It came again, with a great wakening light,
And showed the names whom love of God had blessed,
And, lo! Ben Adhem's name led all the rest!

LEIGH HUNT, "Abou Ben Adhem."

There lies the port: the vessel puffs her sails:
There gloom the dark, broad seas. My mariners,
Souls that have toiled, and wrought, and thought with me,—
That ever with a frolic welcome took

The thunder and the sunshine, and opposed
Free hearts, free foreheads,—you and I are old:
Old age has yet his honor and his toil;
Death closes all: but something ere the end,
Some work of noble note, may yet be done,
Not unbecoming men that strove with Gods.
The lights begin to twinkle from the rocks:
The long day wanes: the slow moon climbs: the deep
Moans round with many voices. Come, my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows: for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset and the baths
Of all the western stars, until I die.
It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
And see the great Achilles whom we knew.
Tho' much is taken, much abides; and tho'
We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heaven; that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

TENNYSON, "Ulysses."

The Moving Finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your Piety nor Wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

OMAR KHAYYAM.

Ah, did you once see Shelley plain,
  And did he stop and speak to you,
And did you speak to him again?
  How strange it seems, and new!

ROBERT BROWNING.

TOPICS FOR TALKS

1. College Grades and Success in Life
2. The Relation of Literature to Advertising
3. Imagination in Selling
4. Capitalizing Courtesy
5. Making Business a Profession
6. Saving Money for the City of ——
7. Where We Are in the Business Cycle
8. Federal Reserve Discount Rate and Its Effects
9. The Book Clubs
10. Permanent Wave
11. Deep-sea Diver
12. Color Film
13. Harness Racing
14. Cyclotron
15. Whimsy
16. Painting
17. Voyage of Adventure
18. Daydreams
19. Inferiority Complex
20. Encouragement for the Arts
21. I Like to Be Alone
22. Dust Bowl
23. The Taft-Hartley Law
24. True-False and Multiple Choice
25. Frozen Foods
26. Should Installment Buying Be Curtailed?
27. Does It Pay to Own a Home?
28. Petroleum Pipe Lines
29. The College Curriculum
30. Prefabricated Houses

CHAPTER XV

CONDUCTING A BUSINESS MEETING

Probably every adult has attended a club meeting where disorder, irrelevant remarks, and horseplay have made any serious business out of the question. But even when the members are steadily earnest and cooperative there is often a great waste of time and a failure to get through a reasonable amount of business. Everything gets tangled. Things are in a jam. The traffic officer is not on the job.

When executives come together to discuss policies, or the members of a committee meet, they can commit themselves to definite and responsible action only by a vote that is registered through the official and legal process of parliamentary law. This sounds formidable but is, as generally practiced, very simple. The few regulations in common use are intended to give the sanction of the whole group to the business transacted and to promote ready, comfortable, and progressive discussion. They discourage rambling, wrangling, and confusion, by requiring that only one person speak at a time and on the motion before the body and that each motion be passed or rejected before another is presented. These rules are not unpleasantly repressive. They do not prevent the tentative informal talk by which the needs and purposes of the group are discovered and which is usually necessary, especially in business practice, before a motion can be formulated. "Cushing's Manual of Parliamentary Practice" says: "The great purpose of all rules and forms is to subserve the will of the assembly rather than to restrain it; to facilitate, and not to obstruct, the expression of their deliberate sense." The meetings that most of us attend are governed by only a few of the great accumulation of rules that make the elaborate and complicated system of the Congress or the state legislature.

Handling a Motion. As the assembly or conference or committee

can take action only through the motions put before it, everybody should know how these may be qualified and reshaped to express as nearly as possible the opinion of the majority. Motions are frequently passed or rejected with a result that is unsatisfactory to almost everybody. The members are the victims of their inexperience with a simple routine.

Let us imagine that the Village Improvement Society is having its monthly meeting. A member rises and says, "Mr. Chairman" (or "Madam Chairman" if a woman is presiding). The chairman nods or addresses the member by name. The member continues. "Our new high school," he says, "will be ready for occupancy in the fall. The interior is going to look pretty barren, however, until it has a little more in the way of decoration than can be supplied from the old school. I think the parents and the pupils of the town would appreciate anything we could do to help out. I should like to move, therefore, that every member of this society pledge himself to give one dollar for the purchase of a portrait of Benjamin Franklin for the school assembly hall." Somebody else may say, "I second the motion." He does not need to rise or get the recognition of the chair. The chairman says, "You have heard the motion." He may repeat it. If it happens to be long or complicated he may ask the member to write it out and give it to the secretary, who may read it when necessary. The chairman says, "Are there any remarks?" or "What is your pleasure?" He recognizes everybody who wishes to speak (one at a time). He should seldom recognize any person more than twice. If nobody wishes to speak, or after all have been heard who ask for recognition, he may say, "Those in favor of the motion signify by saying 'Aye.'" After the ayes he says, "Those opposed, 'No.'" If the vote is in doubt, he may call for a show of hands or ask for a rising vote. The chairman may cast the deciding vote in case of a tie.

Amendments. Now this was a main or principal motion, the kind which introduces any action or business of the assembly, and only one main motion may be considered at a time. If a member should say, before the vote was taken on the motion just considered, "We have

more important business with the school than that. I move that we request the school committee to discharge the headmaster," he would be out of order, and the chair should so rule. But the main motion may be altered or disposed of in several ways. After some discussion but before the vote on the high-school picture, a member gets the floor and says, "Why must we have a picture of Franklin?" He prefers Jefferson, gives his reasons, and closes by saying, "I move to amend the motion by striking out the words 'Benjamin Franklin' and inserting in their place the words 'Thomas Jefferson.'"

An amendment must be germane, relevant, to the main motion. It may be hostile, have for its aim the defeat of the main motion, and still be in order. There are three ways of amending:

1. Inserting, or adding, new words
2. Striking out words
3. Striking out words, and inserting, or adding, new words in their place

The word "not" may not, however, be inserted or added.

The amendment is debatable and takes precedence; that is, it must be voted upon before the main motion is put to vote. Before the chairman calls for the vote another amendment may be made, and this second amendment in turn takes precedence over the first amendment. A member may move, for instance, the further amendment that each member contribute two dollars for the purchase of two pictures, one of Franklin and the other of Jefferson. The order of voting would then be: secondary amendment, primary amendment, main motion. If an amendment is accepted by the mover of a previous amendment or of the main motion, no vote need be taken on it.

Motion to Commit. While the motion and its amendments are pending, someone may argue that immediate action in this matter is liable to be hasty and ill-advised. More time is needed to study the matter. He moves to refer the question to a committee of three appointed by the chair and requested to report at the next meeting. This motion has precedence over amendments and, if it is passed, disposes of all the motions before the body. If not, debate and vote on the second amendment are in order.

Motion to Lay on the Table. Suppose we still have the main motion, two amendments, and the motion to commit hanging as a somewhat precarious cluster. Another member gets tired of the whole business. He may be opposed to giving anything and would like to get rid of the matter at once. He gets the floor and, without any explanation if he prefers not to state his reasons, says, "I move to lay the question on the table."

The motion requires a second but is not debatable and must be put to a vote at once. Only a motion for recess or adjournment could intervene, or take precedence, and that would, if passed, amount to the same thing. If the motion to lay on the table is passed, the question, with all its attached motions, is put off indefinitely. It is rarely reconsidered at the same meeting because the vote has already shown that the assembly is opposed to it. The wording of the motion might imply that the question will be taken from the table at some other meeting, but that is not obligatory and, in fact, seldom happens. The motion is in common use (and abuse) for evasive rejection of embarrassing main motions. A motion laid on the table may be brought up by the words: "I move to take from the table the motion . . ."

The List of Motions. The usual meetings of boards of directors, college faculties, office and shop executives, seldom get into anything more complicated than the situations described above. There is no tangle of rules, and the assembly can always, by general consent, abrogate anything that interferes with its wishes. But the chairman and other leaders should have a more comprehensive and exact knowledge of the several types of motions and their functions. While there is only one main motion, there are about a score of secondary motions, all of which take precedence over the main motion.

Here is a list of the more common motions in their order of precedence. As you look them over, you will see that you cannot make a motion to amend while a motion to refer the question to a committee is being debated. But the motion to postpone to a certain time would be in order, as it has precedence over the motion to commit, and it should be voted on first.

A LIST OF MOTIONS IN THEIR ORDER OF PRECEDENCE[1]

Key: a., amendable; n.a., not amendable; d., debatable; n.d., not debatable; 2/3, requires a two-thirds vote; n.s., no second required.

PRIVILEGED MOTIONS

To fix the time at which to adjourn, d.
To adjourn, n.d.
To take recess, a.
Questions of privilege, n.s.
Call for orders of the day, n.s., n.d.

INCIDENTAL MOTIONS

Point of order, n.s.
Appeal, d.
Objection to the consideration of a question, n.d., 2/3
Reading of papers, n.s., n.d.
Withdrawal of a motion, n.s.
Suspension of rules, n.d., 2/3

SUBSIDIARY MOTIONS

Lay on the table, n.a., n.d.
Previous question (close debate), n.a., n.d., 2/3
Limit or extend debate, a., n.d., 2/3
Postpone to a certain time, a., d.
To commit, a., d.
To postpone indefinitely, d.
To amend, a., d.

PRINCIPAL MOTIONS

Any main question before the house, a., d.

A motion to adjourn is always in order, then, and takes precedence over every other motion except one which states the time and place of adjournment. It is not debatable.

The previous question is intended to stop debate. It does not refer to a

[1] From HOFFMAN, "How to Make Better Speeches," Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York.

previous question but to the one under discussion. When a member says, "I move the previous question," he means, "I move that remarks be closed," or "I move the vote be taken." The motion cannot be amended or debated, but it requires a two-thirds vote to pass. This provision gives protection against the danger of "gag law." Note that *previous question* takes precedence over every other subsidiary motion except *lay on the table* and is out of order if the latter motion has already been made.

The incidental motions are of a different sort. They are concerned with the privileges of the members and with violations of parliamentary procedure.

Suspension of rules is a motion that would be presented in case a society wished to make an exception in its general practice; to allow women, for instance, to attend a meeting; to change the order of business, etc.

Any member may *withdraw his motion* without ceremony before the chairman puts it to the assembly. Later he may request withdrawal, and the chairman will ask, "Are there any objections?" If there are none, the motion is withdrawn. If someone says, "I object," the motion to withdraw must be put to a vote.

The phrase "I object" is, unless the chair invites it, just disorder. It is not to be confused with *objection to the consideration of a motion.* This must be put, if at all, directly after a main motion. The member should rise at once after the chair has stated the motion and before anyone begins the discussion, and say: "Mr. Chairman, I object to the consideration of that question." The objection is not debatable. The chair says: "An objection has been raised to the consideration of this question. Shall the question be considered?" If a third vote yes, the question is considered. A two-thirds negative vote is required to sustain the objection.

A point of order may interrupt all procedure. It is the means provided to correct irregularities or mistakes. If one of the assembly thinks that the person who has the floor is violating a parliamentary rule, speaking

irrelevantly, or engaging in personalities, or if he is disturbed by whispering, moving about, or other disorder in the assembly, he may stand and say, without waiting for recognition, "I rise to a point of order." He may even interrupt a member or the chairman but should, of course, wait, if the matter does not require such disagreeable action, until the speaker has finished. The chairman says: "The member will state his point of order."

The member does so, and the reply is: "The chair decides the point well taken," or "The chair decides the point not well taken," with a stated reason.

Appeal. If the member is not satisfied, he may say: "I appeal from the decision of the chair." No second is required in a point of order or an appeal.

The chairman's formula is: "An appeal is taken. Shall the decision of the chair stand in the judgment of the assembly?"

The appeal is debatable, and the chairman himself may debate without leaving his place. He may also vote, and in case of a tie his decision is sustained. He puts the vote in these words: "Those in favor of sustaining the chair will say, 'Aye'—Those opposed, 'No.'" After the count, he says, "The chair is sustained (or overruled)."

The *call for the orders of the day* is the way to interrupt a speaker or a discussion that is taking time from the definite business or program of the meeting. The chair will usually reply by requesting that the discussion be closed and will proceed to the regular program. If he or any other member thinks the discussion is more important than the matter of turning at once to the orders of the day he may ask for a vote on the *call.* Unless two-thirds or more of the members vote against it, the *call* is approved.

Authoritative Manuals. A chairman is rarely troubled with anything more difficult than what has just been sketched, but he should fortify himself with a book of rules. "Cushing's Manual of Parliamentary Practice," published by M. J. Ivers and Company, New York, and "Robert's Rules of Order," Scott, Foresman & Company, Chicago, are

the best known. Robert's "Parliamentary Practice" (Century Company) is an excellent book of simplified drills and illustrations.

Order of Business. Most societies follow this order:

1. Call to order
2. Reading of the minutes of the previous meeting
3. Reports of standing committees
4. Reports of special committees
5. Unfinished business
6. New business
7. Adjournment

The Chairman. The interest aroused and the business transacted in any meeting depend a great deal upon the alertness of the chairman. He should have a list of the things to be considered, unfinished and new business. He can save time by discouraging needless motions. Committee reports of a routine nature, when they contain no motion, may be disposed of with the phrase: "If there is no objection, the report is accepted." Sometimes, after a main motion has been passed and before another has been presented, a member asks for information from the secretary or the chairman. This starts an informal discussion which may or may not lead up to new business, that is, another main motion. The chair should be reasonable and allow sufficient latitude, especially in small gatherings, but he can always bring the talk to a head by saying, "A motion is in order," or, "Will someone make a motion?" If the motion is not made, he may say, "The next thing in the order of business is . . ." If debate on a motion drags he may say, "Are you ready for the question?" or "Are there any more remarks?" When he is sure he is not depriving anyone of the opportunity of being heard, he puts the question. During debate, when several persons call, "Mr. Chairman," at the same time, the chairman should recognize first someone who has not spoken on the motion and preferably someone he thinks will speak for a point of view not yet given.

The chairman should not take part in the discussion. He may give information when it is requested by a member and he may give suggestions in regard to the handling of motions. He should not try to im-

pose his opinion. If he wishes to persuade the society to his way of thinking, he must ask a member to take the chair while he addresses them. He should use this privilege seldom, however, as his proper business is that of an impartial conductor of the meeting.

The chairman usually remains seated except before large assemblies or when he is introducing a visitor. He opens the meeting with the words: "Will the meeting please come to order." He then says, "The secretary will call the roll." This is often omitted. Next, "The secretary will read the minutes of the previous meeting."

The Secretary's Report. The minutes need not follow a strict formula. They may begin somewhat like this:

> The regular meeting of the X.Y.Z. Club was held on January 5, at 8.15 P.M., with President George Whitaker in the chair. The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.
>
> Mr. Smith, chairman of the membership committee, reported that we now have sixty-eight members, and urged the members to bring as guests to our dinner on January 29 their friends who may be interested in joining the Club.
>
> On motion of Mr. Wilcox it was voted to contribute twenty-five dollars to the Community Chest of Lakeville.

The minutes should contain a record of all motions presented and all votes taken. The secretary may use his discretion in recording debate but should be impartial and impersonal in his reviews or summaries. He may close his report with a phrase like: "The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 P.M."

When the reading is concluded the chairman says, "Are there any errors or omissions?" After a pause, "The minutes stand approved." If someone has a correction, it may be put like this: "Mr. Chairman, the secretary omitted to record a motion by Mr. Robinson to . . ." or "The secretary is in error, I think, in regard to . . ."

When no further changes are recommended, the chairman, who may also make corrections, will say, "If there are no further errors or omissions, the record, as corrected, stands approved." No motion is necessary.

Next come the committee reports. If there are no regular reports, or if there is no specific report due at the meeting, the chairman may

simply say, "Are there any committee reports?" He will wait for volunteers. A member may rise and say, "Mr. Chairman, I should like to report for the finance committee." If his remarks are extended, he should go to the front of the room. After the report the chairman may invite question and comment, after which he may say, without a motion, "The report is accepted. Are there any other reports?" or "Will the program committee report?"

After the committees have been heard, the chairman reminds the members of the "unfinished business" carried over from the last meeting. He attempts to get action on this before he considers new business. When this last is disposed of he may say, "If there is nothing else, the meeting is adjourned," or "A motion to adjourn is in order." Of course, it is always in order, and meetings that are long or tiresome are often adjourned on motions of members without regard to the business left unfinished. An efficient chairman will see that matters which must be attended to are not overlooked.

The chairman should, as a general practice, speak of himself in the third person; as, "The chair rules," "The chair is in doubt," "Will the member inform the chair?" "The chair will appoint," etc.

A good chairman can save valuable time. He can often prevent fatal postponement and delay; he can frequently put the brakes on hasty and ill-considered suggestions. His slogan is: discussion, decision, dispatch.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. It is easy for every class in public speaking to conduct its meetings through parliamentary forms The instructor, or the executive committee appointed by him, may announce a different chairman, secretary, and list of committees for each session, by calling them off in alphabetical order from the class roll. Instead of the usual standing committees occupied with membership, finance, program, entertainment, and the like, the class will have committees concerned with its own special business The class talks may be grouped under a few heads of common and recurring interest Standing committees like the following are suggested

1. Committee on Business
2. Commttee on Literature
3. Committee on Science
4. Committee on Foreign Affairs
5. Committee on Education
6. Committee on Art
7. Committee on Parliamentary Practice
8. Committee on Resolutions (motions)

To these may be added, as time allows, or the desire for variety prompts, committees on

9. Salesmanship
10. Business-letter Writing
11. Travel
12. Politics
13. Biography
14. College Questions
15. Local, State, or National Problems

Some of these committees overlap, but the specific matters on which they report are always different, as will be indicated in a moment.

Special committees are only temporary, elected by the organization or appointed by the chairman to investigate and report on specific problems, like the buying of decorations or the planning of a memorial In class it may be the looking up of special information On special committees three persons may be named, but for the regular standing committees it will be found more convenient and practical to name only one student every day.

What to Report. If a member is appointed on "business" he should not think vaguely and indefinitely about the whole field of business and report at

the meeting something like this: "Business was about the same as usual last week, so I have nothing to report." Let him find a specific business problem. The first newspaper he picks up may have a good article about the railroads, or the coal mines, about a new building, or the proposed tariff reductions. He may give a review of an article in *Business Week, Printer's Ink,* or some other magazine of business.

Literature is managed just as readily. A character, situation, or social problem from a classic or a current novel may serve. A lively reading is acceptable. A chapter of science, history, or biography may furnish plenty of attractive material. Book reviews from the supplement of the Sunday *New York Times,* from the *Saturday Review of Literature,* and from other magazines yield good stories about men and books.

Education need not be confined to college subjects. "Learning How to Sell Rugs," "Teaching in a Sunday School," "Two Months on an Oil Tanker" are appropriate topics.

Art should not dismay the committee member. If he is worried about museum display or technique, let him examine the ways of business in making common things beautiful, artistic. Automobiles, house furnishings, landscape effects, may interest him. He may show how a bank or office building copies certain features of a Greek temple or a Florentine palace. The houses, churches, and public buildings of fifty years ago may be compared with those of recent design.

Foreign affairs should not remain so foreign. There are plenty of interesting articles on France, England, Germany, Russia, and other countries.

Biography is of increasing interest. Prominent men and women of our own day may furnish better themes than the celebrities of the past. Dates and lists of achievements are in themselves rather dull and meaningless. What was there in the bringing up of the man that handicapped or stimulated his thinking? What were the motives, the accidents, the failures, the personal peculiarities, as well as the character and triumphs that made the whole man? To get the right point of view read the biographical essays, the "psychographs," of Gamaliel Bradford.

Other committee reports should be prepared in similar fashion. A specific and inviting topic should be drawn from the general field.

Reports should not be more than three or four minutes long. The class may discuss them and put motions about them. In case these fail to yield satisfactory practice, two committees are provided to encourage parliamentary procedure.

Committee on Motions. Not many of the reports may have debatable material, but the committee assigned to bring a motion to the class must find a live question that will provoke a clash of opinion; and to make sure of this

it may be necessary to appoint two or three members, each to bring in a different question. These problems need not be of world-wide importance. They may concern a change in the management of the lunch counter or the distribution of study periods. They may relate to the buying of pictures for the school, to the offering of more electives. They may furnish debate about a new park or zoning system, the control of traffic downtown, a bill in the legislature. Editorials and letters to the editor contain ideas for many a good intellectual bout. Whatever it is, the student should give a three- or four-minute talk for his point of view and conclude with his motion in this manner: "So I move, Mr. Chairman, that this class go on record as approving [or opposing] the principle of branch banking," or, "I move that this class favor the honor system for the college."

Committee on Practice. This committee may illustrate and discuss a parliamentary problem at every meeting. Suppose that the student, in glancing through a volume on parliamentary law, came upon the motion to lay on the table. He would learn that its purpose is to delay decision on the main question, that it is commonly used to forestall hasty or embarrassing action. It takes precedence, he would discover, over other subsidiary motions. It is still in order after motions have been made, but not passed, to amend the main motion, to refer it to a committee, to postpone it to a certain time. Even the previous question, a motion for an immediate vote, must be put aside with the others until a vote has been made on the motion, if it is made, to lay the question on the table. The motion is not debatable and, if carried, places on the table the main motion and the subsidiary motions that adhere to it.

What can the learner do with this information? He can bide his time in the next meeting, listen to a debate on a motion, wait to see if someone will move to amend or to refer to a committee, and then move to lay the question on the table. Of course if no amendments or other motions intervene, he must speak up before the chairman gets a vote on the main question. After the vote he may give his report and explain the purpose of this motion and its relation to other procedure. Or he may wait his turn and talk about it when the chairman calls on him.

The chairman and the instructor should try to keep the meeting lively and not hesitate, when necessary, to interrupt parliamentary form for explanation or to get reluctant members on their feet.

II. Find answers to the following questions, in some manual of parliamentary law. Be prepared, when it is desirable, to illustrate the usage in a specific case.

1. What is meant by: "I move the previous question"?
2. What is a "question of privilege"?
3. How may a motion be withdrawn?

4. Discuss the motion to adjourn. Is it always in order or ever debatable?
5. What questions require a two-thirds vote?
6. What is "a committee of the whole"?
7. Explain the use of the motion to reconsider. To what members is it restricted?
8. What are principal motions?
9. How do subsidiary motions differ from incidental motions?
10. What are privileged motions?
11. What is the question of consideration?
12. What points should a constitution cover?
13. What are by-laws?
14. What is a quorum?
15. What are the steps in organizing a permanent society?

III. In about two hundred words tell why a member of the class was a superior chairman.

IV. Write a page theme telling why some student gave the most useful talk on a motion.

V. Discuss the parliamentary strategy by which a student made a quick and effective disposition of some business.

VI. Present one of the following motions for debate. The class may change them by amendments or other secondary motions. Resolved, that:

1. Final examinations should be abolished.
2. We favor the principle of the closed shop.
3. A city is the best place for a college.
4. The UN should abolish the veto.
5. Capital punishment should be abolished.
6. Congress should pass a national daylight-saving law.
7. This city should adopt the City Manager Plan.
8. Mr. ——— should be elected governor of the state.
9. Mr. ——— should be elected United States Senator.
10. Mr. ——— should be our next mayor.
11. The United States Senate should abolish the privilege of unlimited debate.
12. The Olympic Games do more harm than good.
13. Married women should be allowed to teach in the public schools.
14. The President should be elected for a term of six years and should not be eligible for reelection.
15. Billboards should be abolished.
16. The world is getting better.
17. Christmas giving should be discouraged.

18. The state should appropriate money to advertise its advantages.
19. Immigration quotas should be increased.
20. College courses should be elective.
21. Advertising makes for higher prices.
22. America offers more opportunities than ever.
23. Coeducation should be encouraged.
24. You can't change human nature.
25. Pari-mutuels should be abolished.
26. We are opposed to public-opinion polls.
27. The college student should be allowed unlimited "cuts."
28. This class opposes universal military training.
29. Government should legalize and operate lotteries.
30. "Mercy killing" should be legalized.

CHAPTER XVI

CONFERENCE AND ROUND TABLE

THE CONFERENCE

A conference is an interchange of opinion to get desired results. It requires a capable leader, one who gives it efficient preparation, management, and follow-up, one who knows how to reduce the waste of excessive, irrelevant, and sterile talk.

The good conference is progressive. It goes step by step to its purpose, decisions, and solutions. These steps should not be as obvious, as measured, and as abrupt as the steps of a staircase, but they should be clear enough to the attentive participant or observer. The leader should take them decisively, though informally.

Earle S. Hannaford's book, *Conference Leadership in Business and Industry,*[1] certainly one of the most practical, detailed, and illuminating books on this subject, gives five necessary steps.

Step I—The Approach. This is calling the conference to order and stating the purpose of the meeting. The leader has to get the proper attention and mood for the business at hand. Executives are people. They like a little social chitchat when they get together. The tactful leader allows this but soon breaks it up by tapping or calling for order. He pauses for silence and then briefly and clearly states the purpose of the conference.

Step II—The Drawing Out. During this phase of the discussion the leader encourages the expression of opinion. He asks overhead questions—questions for any or all to answer. He also directs questions to individuals who he thinks will give interesting, informative, or provocative replies. He stimulates the group to disclose pros and cons, advantages and disadvantages. He takes part himself as one of the group

[1] Published by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1945.

in search of a common denominator, something that all or the majority can agree on in a disputed area. His success with this step consists in drawing out everyone present—the timid, the shy, the fluent, the logical, the suspicious, the antagonistic—to a free flow of expression.

It is in this principal phase of the conference that the leader must show experienced skill. He invites talk, but he must also "keep it on the beam." Talk by a group of intimate executives may get out of control. There are liable to be too many personal experiences, stories, irrelevant discussion of things interesting and perhaps important to everyone present but not related to the problem under consideration at the moment.

The good leader anticipates and controls this situation. He isn't a disciplinarian who pulls his group up sharply at every irrelevancy. That would be the quickest way to shut them up to injured silence and nonparticipation. A sense of humor and a cheerful patience are also factors of efficiency in human relations.

At a pause in the talk the leader may say, "We've rushed by a good point John made. I'd like to hear more about that. Some of you are dealing with it every day. How do you feel about that, George?" Or he may quite frankly say, "The time is passing, fellows, and we still haven't come to any agreement about staggering the work hours. Don't you think we ought to settle that first?"

Step III—The Acceptance. General agreement is the aim in a controversial matter. Perhaps it can't be reached because necessary information is not available. The question may be in the doubtful, speculative stage and may need further exploring. Conflicting opinions may not be reconciled and practical adjustments are not discovered. At any rate, the leader will attempt to get a majority to agree on certain recommendations or conclusions, if nothing more than an agreement to put the matter over to another meeting. The chairman should be sure that he has this general acceptance, either by a show of hands or by a definite expression of opinion from every member of the conference.

Step IV—The Summation. The leader should summarize the results of the conference before dismissing it. He should also summarize oc-

casionally in the course of the discussion to show whether or what progress has been made. This serves also as a tactful reminder to garrulous, illogical, and indifferent members of the group that the leader expects thoughtful, purposive speech. Some leaders have crayons, easels, and large sheets of paper at hand to write out principal conclusions from time to time. This appeal to the eye as well as to the ear makes memory doubly retentive and presents an easy, up-to-the-moment outline of what the conference has accomplished.

Step V—Association. This step may not be necessary in some cases. Most writers do not mention it, but Mr. Hannaford thinks it is often necessary to associate the conclusions and summary with the over-all picture of the office or factory. Everything is related to something else. Decisions and points of view should be properly related to the general policy and purpose of the business. "Failure to do this," says Mr. Hannaford, "eliminates a final check as to the accuracy and workability of the decision that has been reached."

Normal Thought Processes. Notice how closely Mr. Hannaford's pattern for a business conference corresponds to what he calls the "normal thought process."

Step I. Recognize and isolate problem
Step II. Assemble known facts and evaluate them
Step III. Make trial conclusion, which may have to be changed, modified, or varied
Step IV. Set up final conclusion
Step V. Check results to determine need for revision

These steps have been gradually evolved through the centuries of civilized man. Aristotle, Bacon, Herbert Spencer, and our own present-day John Dewey have been vigorous exponents of the scientific method in thinking. Dewey says we don't think until we recognize a "felt difficulty." He says the first step in thinking is locating and defining the difficulty. This is just a different phrasing of Mr. Hannaford's first step.

We might put it another way: the first step is to ask the right questions to discover the problem. The rest is comparatively easy. Answers and solutions will normally follow. It is on this first principle that

efficiency experts—now called "industrial engineers" (a little lesson in semantics)—have founded their success.

Qualities of Leadership Necessary. You can see that a leader of conferences must have a temperament and an acquired skill for this sort of thing. If he is the boss or superior of the persons called for the conference, his leadership is all the more difficult. He may only inspire caution, timidity, yes-man responses and the general attitude of not sticking one's neck out. There will be little frank and free discussion.

The leader may not alter this condition at once by assuming an air of good fellowship and ease. If his other relations with the men have made him distrusted and disliked, he will have to give more studious attention to the art of human relations.

This situation is not common, however. As a rule, executives meet on an equal footing, and there is more likely to be unrestrained and excessive talk. To convert this into orderly, progressive production is the leader's job. He must himself be orderly without being officious. He must have plans and foresight without seeming to impose them on his fellows. It won't do to follow an outline too closely. Sometimes it will be wise to follow the group, let it have its own way, be pleasantly patient with a bit of frolic, and bring it back to the point without causing resentment.

Asking Questions. The leader needs questions almost as much as the scientist. He is exploring minds, sorting knowledge, trying to discover enough to get some group conclusions. But the questions must be right. Sometimes they will be asked for anybody to answer. At other times they will be directed to individuals, and they must be directed to the right individuals.

You noticed how careful Mr. Fadiman was, on the radio program Information Please, to ask his visiting guest only questions he could answer with ease. The guest must not be embarrassed or made to feel insecure. This thoughtfulness should be part of every leader's technique. Of course, "I don't know" should be a common and unembarrassed reply, but it should come from either those who are authorities on the subject or from those who are not expected to know much about the

subject. Many persons have an inferiority complex and think they ought to know when they don't. This simply means that the leader must have enough acquaintance with the members of the conference to avoid "showing up" anybody or causing him to lose face.

The leader tries to get everyone into the discussion and for this reason will direct a question to a silent, self-conscious person just to help him feel he "belongs." This is good, but the question must be such that almost anybody could answer comfortably. It may be, "Has your department had any trouble with this, Jim?" "Yes" or "No" may be the only response, and that may make the self-consciousness worse. The question should coax comment, narration of personal experience. It would be better to ask, "How do you ship these items, Jim?"

Preparation for the Conference. The day-by-day conferences may be pretty good without much preparation, but over the year considerable is lost in time, money, and productive results because of the casual, impromptu nature of many conferences. To prevent this, companies are conducting programs of conference training. Some firms are becoming more systematic. They have printed forms to notify executives of a conference days ahead. Names of those requested to be present are checked from a printed list. The subject or purpose of the conference is written in. Members may be asked to come with equipment, charts, or reports. The conference already looks like business, and the members give it a new respect as such.

The Follow-up. Assume that everything has "clicked" at the conference. Everybody enjoyed meeting everybody else and plenty of business was done. But was it? Decisions were made, motions passed, and committees appointed. The leader congratulates himself on a good job. But what has he got? Mostly promises—worthless until they are translated into action. Harold Saunders is to do something, Peter Ludenschlager something else. Who will see that plans and policies are something beside paper and votes?

The competent leader does not let these good intentions die without a fight. He has forms for progress reports. He sends these or personal notes to the committees or executives concerned.

Last of all, the leader should not take his theories and plans too literally. When he has read Mr. Hannaford's book, for instance, and has become aware of the methods for improving conferences, he need not worry about all the details and terms and diagrams. If he remembers the five steps of the general conference process and the five steps of the normal thought process, he will be on his way to the five success elements in every speech situation: confidence, character, courtesy, control, and completeness.

THE ROUND TABLE

The round table is in many respects the public performance of a private conference. It follows the same pattern of development in the Approach, Drawing Out, Acceptance, and Summation. The leader conducts it much as he would a conference, but he keeps in mind the important difference that the discussion is for the benefit of the audience and not primarily of the speakers.

The Subject. The round tables on the air are mostly about controversial questions—universal military training, defense measures, housing, labor-management relations, and so on. But many are merely informational, giving in dialogue facts about books, soil conservation, foreign affairs, and other matters of public interest. Conventions of teachers, scientists, doctors, and others sometimes find this method of discussion more practical and down-to-earth than the long, colorless written speeches. Dialogue is the essence of drama and is more likely to produce variety, suspense, and clash of opinion than the monologue.

Preparation for the Round Table. Some round tables are pretty poor, however. They leave an audience feeling that a well-prepared five-minute talk would have been more informative than the half-hour conversation that rambled in confusing interruption and extraneous detail. There was no real leadership and no preparation by the speakers for planned, progressive talk.

For the radio, round tables are sometimes written out and read from the script. This procedure, though it ensures a kind of order and trimness, violates the necessary principle of spontaneous talk. The method

of the University of Chicago Round Table is better. The members of the Round Table confer some days before the broadcast and decide on a list of topics and questions in connection with their subject. These are put in an order that promises the greatest interest, clarity, and emphasis. The members then give themselves a tentative rehearsal by discussing the subject from their outline, about as they will in their broadcast. They discover weak links, spots that are dull and too general, items that need more detail, facts to be looked up, things to be left out for lack of time. They are having a round of exploration to tighten and sharpen their public performance. Nothing is memorized, but the speakers prepare as they would if they were giving extemporaneous talks.

The leader may, of course, read his introductory remarks to his invisible audience. This will make for a prompt, concise, interest-catching introduction. He introduces his colleagues smoothly, announces the subject, and speaks of a significant issue that will hold the listeners.

As he concludes the Approach, he opens the Drawing Out with a question, "Smith, what do you think is the heart of this problem?" Everybody, the leader included, takes part, as he wishes, in the discussion.

When a round table is on the air, the leader must carefully check the passage of time. He has already made rough approximations—three minutes for this, five minutes for that. Yet he must allow for unpredictable elements, by-play with Robinson's whimsy, long-windedness by Jones. After all, you can't package free speech neatly, even when it is limited to fifteen minutes or a half hour.

So the leader is fairly busy, what with helping to keep the conversation going, bringing irrelevant talk back to the point at issue, tactfully stopping a somewhat heated argument, making summaries when they seem useful, and trying to complete the program before the announcer interrupts with, "You have been listening to . . ."

Team Play. A good round table requires alertness and responsibility from every participant. He is a member of a team that wants to win a game or a battle for audience approval. He may, in a sense, say what

he wishes about anything that comes up. But the rules of good conversation must be more thoughtfully observed. The ball of talk must be tossed about more equitably. No one should hold it too long. Argument should not become embarrassing or a face-saving duel. Interruption, overeagerness to win a point, is regarded unfavorably by every audience.

Cooperation instead of Competition. Look at the conference or round table as a search for truth, an attempt to reconcile a clash of interests or opinions, an effort to find workable solutions or compromises. It is true that on the air representatives of capital and labor are somewhat like debaters. They can't concede too much without offending a great many partisans listening in. But the outstanding merit of a round table should be its objective, factual point of view. Oratory, evasion, propaganda are cut down by probing questions and comment.

Qualified Opinion. The good speaker in a round table does not get out on a limb with rash, dogmatic statements. He doesn't have to defend himself or crawl back in humiliating retreat. He asks good questions as if he wanted information. He presents his point of view tentatively but firmly. He is likely to preserve a modest, open-minded attitude with remarks like "It seems to me," or "There is one thing that isn't clear to me," or "What do you think of this?" He continues with "If I'm not mistaken," or "Perhaps we have overlooked this point." He is always in a position where he can agree or disagree, or even change his mind without a sense of defeat or disgrace. He is always inquiring, suggesting, proposing, never challenging, always looking for a reasonable profit for everybody.

All this may seem only courtesy, but it is the salesman's technique for winning his way while the buyer thinks he is winning the arguments and making up his own mind.

Vocal Quality. The round table is conversation but it is also public speaking when a visible audience is present. While the speakers are addressing one another they are also addressing the audience. They must be heard by everybody. Low, thin tones are an exasperation. The speakers should glance around the room frequently. Comfortable breathing,

a deliberate rate of speech, and full-bodied tones that start at the diaphragm will carry the voice without straining for volume. Pauses are natural and often effective but should not be filled with *uh's* and *er's*.

Vital but unexcited talk will keep the pitch level in a pleasant middle register. Strained argument will hurry the rate and produce nervous, squeaky delivery.

Listening. Speakers often worry too much about taking their full share of the talk. They think it is their turn to speak before an idea shapes itself up clearly. This leads to obscure and banal comment, and the speaker finishes by wishing he had said nothing. As long as someone else is carrying the ball, cool listening pays off better. There is time for reflection, for finding a core of thought that prompts firm and decisive speaking.

Bearing. Sit comfortably erect. Don't throw one leg awkwardly over the other. Don't loll. Don't put your hand to your face or down the back of your neck. Don't put your hand to your mouth while speaking. This self-conscious gesture utterly spoils tone, making it indistinct or inaudible.

Face the audience as much as you can without having an unnatural position in relation to the other speakers. If the audience has only a profile view of you, turn to them frequently to include them in your remarks; otherwise your voice will not seem clear and your eyes cannot contribute their full value in holding attention.

Practice in Round Table. The round table is fine practice in developing vocabulary, fluent, courteous, precise expression, quick thinking, and effective extemporizing. For those troubled with stage fright it is an easy approach to public speaking. The student is part of a group, he gets encouragement from his colleagues, and he can speak as his mood and knowledge prompt him.

But the round table requires more preparation than many students are willing to give it. The members appointed should meet to select and consider their subject. When the chairman has been chosen and the outline of procedure made, each member should read up on the topic as a whole or get information on a special point assigned to him.

A lack of certain facts might not be important if the round-table members were merely talking for their own benefit, but they are trying to enlighten and entertain their classmates or others. The round table must be better informed than the audience. It must lead, educate, stimulate. Even when the general ideas are familiar, they must be made more impressive by detail, illustration, interpretation. Studying sources, background, cause and effect may disclose a complexity that cannot be understood or explained away by shallow or wishful thinking.

Thoughtful discussion is the best way to develop mature, discriminating adult education. "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly," says Macaulay, "as when they discuss it freely."

After the round table the audience should be invited to ask questions. These will test the speakers' preparation and give them more practice in extemporaneous speaking.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Divide the class into groups of three, four, or five as seems most profitable. (The classroom platform may not accommodate more than three.) Ask them to select a subject from the following list or take any other subject they may prefer. Give each group at least a week to prepare for a round table before the class.

1. Radio Advertising
2. Socialized Medicine
3. The Use of Music in Industry
4. How to Improve the College Curriculum
5. White-collar Jobs
6. What Is Personality and How Can It Be Improved?
7. Gate Receipts
8. Juvenile Delinquency
9. How to Increase Our Foreign Trade
10. Monopolies in Labor and Capital
11. Foreign Films
12. Larger Immigration Quotas?
13. What's New in Television?
14. British Socialism
15. What Is the Trouble with the Merchant Marine?
16. Should Colleges Subsidize Athletes?
17. Getting behind the Iron Curtain
18. Should the State Control the Sale of Liquor?
19. Should Government Take More Active Control of Radio?
20. What Can Be Done about Atomic Energy?
21. The Veterans of the Second World War
22. Is Japan Profiting by Democratic Practices?
23. Is America Too Rich to Have Friends?
24. The Committee on Un-American Activities
25. The Increasing Birth Rate
26. What's Wrong with Our Training of Youth?
27. We Discuss a Well known Book
28. High-brow and Low-brow
29. We Want Better Newspapers
30. How's Business?

CHAPTER XVII

HUMOR IN PUBLIC SPEAKING

Humor is liable to be a melancholy subject for the speaker who is trying to get a few laughs from his audience. He goes sadly through his list of jokes, knowing that what he once thought was very funny will now have a moldy look. Not a laugh in a carload. People have caught up with the jokes—read them in *The Reader's Digest* or heard them on the air.

Still, one of these stories may do, he thinks, if it undergoes a little face lifting and is actually relevant to an idea he is presenting. So he changes names and places, pretends the thing happened to himself or the toastmaster, stretches it into a little anecdote that may be pointed and pleasant, and hopes for the best.

"That Reminds Me." This wind-up will spoil almost any story. "Remind" sounds like a hypocritical way of introducing an old gag. It is the one thing the speaker could not forget. He needed no reminder and only irritated the audience with this pretence of spontaneity. Don't remind, don't anticipate, don't prepare your audience. Don't say, in effect, "I'm going to tell you a story."

Get into it at once. "Last Monday I was on my way home from the office," or "Four marines were playing bridge on a small island in the Pacific." Your audience won't be ahead of you. They won't know what to expect. They won't know whether the story is real or fictitious, serious or comic, until the very end. If it falls flat, you'll be on your way again before your listeners have had time to realize that you've "laid an egg."

Jokes have their place, and many speakers keep a file of those they enjoy—stories that illustrate thrift, generosity, courage, laziness, worry, patience, promptness, ignorance, competition, optimism, pessimism, and

other fundamental traits to which every speaker is sure to refer. But they are not always necessary or helpful. Think how seldom you see or hear them in serious speeches.

The fact is that when you have something to say, you don't feel the need of humor. And for that reason you are often relaxed enough to think of something mildly amusing as you go along—references to the chairman, the occasion, other speakers, or topics in your speech.

There are many occasions, of course, where joviality prevails. The dinners of students, employees, or club members may be followed by reminiscence, chaff, good-humored comments on mutual acquaintances and experiences. You will do well enough in such instances with a short talk of cheerful greeting. The core of an idea about the job, the dinner, the plans of the organization, the work of individual members, the glance at the future, what you've all been through, hopes and disappointments, may lead to refreshing treatment of a mock-serious theme. Quotation, a bit of poetry, may help. Thoughtful brevity will save you from failure. Show your sense of humor by avoiding the long-winded, obvious vaporings.

Humor Can Be Cultivated. Humor is made up of confidence, independence, boldness, and observation. It dares to do the unexpected, which is the characteristic quality of humor. The genuine humorist, to be sure, has tact, understanding, a sense of proportion that guides him in strange paths, but many speakers have reputations as humorists because they have learned from study and experience a few formulas that may be safely counted upon to manufacture laughs. Once a man has successfully "sprung" something, he thinks he is a humorist, and that thought keeps him actively laying traps to repeat. Mark Twain was once complimented for a brilliant bit that seemed to flash spontaneously from him, but he somewhat dejectedly replied that he deserved no praise. He had spent the whole evening in steering the conversation toward his witticism and he did not think it was worth the effort. In the same way a speaker sometimes gets a story and builds a speech around it.

Collecting samples of wit and humor will never generate anything

in the collector. He may be able to pass them on to others with some show of cleverness, but he will not get out of the retailing class. Humor is a matter of attitudes, or points of view. Get an enjoyable familiarity with Shaw and Chesterton and the long line of English humorists and satirists before them. Read F. P. A., Don Marquis, George Ade, Robert Benchley, and other American "masters of the wisecrack." Read the more penetrating novelists of our day. It is not enough, however, that the student become sophisticated to the extent of discerning "hokum, bunkum and blah." That may produce only an acid, "smart-alec" kind of wit. The real humorist is quick enough to puncture shams, but he is quicker to raise up sympathy, good cheer, tolerance, playful frolic, and jest. His laugh at pompous fraud or stupid solemnity does not disclose conceit on his own part. Live with humorists and you will catch something of their sincerity and courage, of their dash and originality. Environment works as surely here as elsewhere.

What We Laugh At. The philosophers and psychologists have written a great deal about humor. They have explained why we laugh, and they have analyzed innumerable jokes, witticisms, amusing situations, and remarks. Though their definitions and classifications still leave us to the chances of our own inspiration, they have disclosed several rather specific sources of humor.

Henri Bergson's "Laughter" is perhaps the best known book on the subject. The author arrives at the conclusion, stated in a dozen different ways, that what we laugh at is always some form of absent-mindedness, some clumsy, inelastic attitude of mind or body. "We laugh every time a person gives us the impression of being a thing." "This rigidity is comic, and laughter is its corrective." From this generality we draw the familiar idea that over-serious persons may become comic. Reformers, "cranks," earnest, well-meaning men and women may reveal a laughable rigidity of mind. Humor isolates and underlines, with gentle or severe ridicule, this lack of proportion, just as the cartoon, by exaggerating a prominent feature of the politician's face, emphasizes, paradoxically, a truth.

Disguises. Bergson says further that any disguise, whether of a man

or of society, tends to be comic. "The ceremonial side of social life must, therefore, always include a latent comic element, which is only waiting for an opportunity to burst into full view." So parody, burlesque, satire, mockery, were as popular in the days of Aristophanes or of Molière as they are in these of Donald Ogden Stewart and James Thurber.

As a corollary of this principle, Bergson asserts that "any form or formula is a ready-made frame into which the comic element may be fitted." Rules, regulations, dogmas, arguments, proverbs, stereotypes of all kinds, have something rigid, inelastic, and unsocial that provokes laughter.

Patterns. Speaking of familiar word patterns, Bergson applies the same test and says, "A comic meaning is invariably obtained when an absurd idea is fitted into a well-established phrase-form." This is one of the easiest and commonest types of humor. Examine any newspaper and you will find this trick. Example: "Has anyone thought to suggest that the legend, 'Post no bills,' be put on all the mail boxes?"

Notice how frequently Strickland W. Gillilan exploits this formula. (Humor, too, has its rigidities.) The quotations are from a speech he delivered at a dinner of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

> I am very glad indeed to be here and look into your faces. God knows there are faces here that ought to be looked into once in a while. [Laughter.] . . . As my father used to say when he led me to the woodshed with a barrel stave in one hand and me in the other, "It is going to hurt you a great deal more than it hurts me." . . . I lived on a farm until I became so familiar with it that I felt the contempt which comes from familiarity. [Laughter.] I rather think I was the originator, at least I was always said to have been the originator, of a back-to-the-farm movement. I turned mine on ours at the first opportunity. [Laughter.] I rather think that when I did this and gave up the plow for the pen, literature's loss was agriculture's gain. [Laughter.] . . . I came from Ohio, as did Senator Willis and everybody else who could. [Laughter.]

Most persons never look at words singly. They take them in clusters and so are easily surprised into laughter by the incongruity between

the familiar meaning and the absurd idea suggested by the comedian in the same words.

Anecdotes. Mr. Gillilan is not restricted, however, to this form of witticism. He tells the anecdote, the longer story, well and takes care to make it seem a natural illustration of his theme. Here is an example:

When it comes to care in avoiding saying anything, I have taken as my example a man I heard of out in Indiana some time ago. The game warden in Indiana found that somebody in Rush County had been gigging for fish through the ice, contrary to law. He rounded up the one hard nut in the neighborhood that they blamed everything on to see whether he was guilty or not. They called in the neighbors to testify against this fellow and the neighbors were afraid to testify against him for fear he might do them harm —hamstring a cow or burn a barn or something like that.

One man was on the witness stand and the squire asked, "Did you on the sixteenth of January see a hole in the ice and a pool above Wilson's dam?"

"Yeah."

"Could you tell from the appearance of the hole and the surrounding particles of ice whether it was made recently or some time ago?"

He said, "I couldn't tell, Squire, whether that was a this-winter's hole or a last-winter's hole in the ice." [Laughter.]

The Disarming Laugh. Many speakers have a trick of beginning with jokes on themselves. These dissolve the doubting, bristling, or wary attitudes of audiences and leave them receptive to what follows. The critical faculty is lulled in the more intimate, sympathetic atmosphere. Senator Willis of Ohio, in the opening remarks of an after-dinner speech, gives us this cue:

I know pretty well the attitude of banqueters about this time in the evening. It makes me think of an experience that I had over in Van Wert County, Ohio, within a year. I was attending a Grange supper—and, thank God, there are people in this country yet who eat supper in the evening. [Laughter.] If we ever get to the place where everybody eats dinner in the evening, there is no hope for the country at all.

This was a good old-fashioned Grange supper. After the supper was over, the young people were playing games and having a perfectly delightful time.

Finally the time came for the more serious part of the evening's performance. It had been threatened in the hand bills that had been passed out that I was to make a speech. The presiding officer, not performing the duties of that office with delicacy and finesse, as the present presiding officer has done, but somewhat overcome by the importance of the occasion and the burdensomeness of the duties he was to perform, finally called the meeting to order and proceeded to introduce me in this somewhat questionable fashion. He said, "Now, ladies and gentlemen, we have been having a good time; shall we change the program now and begin the speaking?" [Laughter.]

Charles M. Schwab was publicly presented with a bronze tablet in recognition of his services during the First World War. He was in the most trying position a speaker has to face. He began his reply as follows:

When I was a young man, coming home from the mills one day, very proud of the importance of my position as manager, a working man's wife and little girl passed by, and the wife said to the little child, "Look, dear, that is Mr. Schwab in the buggy." I was seated in a buggy beside a colored driver, and the little girl immediately asked, "Which one, mamma?" [Laughter.] . . .

Just after the war, I was in England, and I met a soldier one day, who was decorated with medals from one shoulder to the other, and I said, "Now there is some great distinguished man whom I must meet and get his history," and going up to the man, I asked him if he would mind telling me the circumstances that led to all these honors that he possessed, and he said he would do so with pleasure. He said, "Now, this one, this first large medal that you see on my left, I received by mistake, and I have all the others given to me because I had the first one."

Playful Audacity. Some speakers "set the table on a roar" by an unexpected brutality, a hardihood that just falls short of insult. This is especially effective in the more familiar circles of men's clubs. Heard at a Rotary Club:

CHAIRMAN: I won't spend much time on today's speaker. You've met him before. He's a relative of mine, a brother-in-law, in fact, and that's enough to tell you how we get along together. We don't. We disagree in business, in politics, in religion, in prohibition. When I go down to Boston to see him, he's

an ardent dry. When he comes here to see me, he's a dripping wet. But he's not all wet at that, and I take pleasure in introducing Professor Samuel T. Waters of Union University.

SPEAKER: Gentlemen: I won't waste your time by speaking about my relatives. Relatively speaking, there isn't much to say about them. But I will tell you how George treats me—and that is, very seldom.

This kind of fooling is hard to resist. It dramatizes something homely and earthy in every listener's experience and is at the same time a hilarious reversal, almost a mockery, of the expected sentimental, complimentary introduction.

Exaggeration. The most noticeable characteristic of American humor is said to be exaggeration. Here is an English parody of it.

AMERICAN TOURIST (looking over some melons): Are these the biggest apples you can raise in this country?

COSTERMONGER: Stop fingering those grapes.

Understatement is even more effective. Congressman Sherwood said of the eighty-five-year-old Joseph G. Cannon:

Uncle Joe, it is true, has passed the period of adolescence and has reached the age of discretion.

Anticlimax is a sudden collapse from a serious crescendo. Cannon, in reply to Sherwood, said:

The year of 1872 was a memorable one in many respects. Vesuvius had a violent eruption that year and General Sherwood and I were elected to the house.

Then, again, after a review of the political setting of 1872:

Rodenberg, at the age of seven, was winning his way with, "You can scarce expect one of my age," and the ambitions of Claude Kitchen and Nick Longworth, at the age of three, were centered about their first pants.

Professional Jargon. Bergson says that "a comic effect is always obtained by transposing the natural expression of an idea into another key." The key may be higher or lower or simply unexpected. So we

get degradation, sublimity, parody, irony, and transposition. Much of our current humor consists in transposing certain conventional ideas out of their customary language of dignified seriousness into the jargon of business or slang. This technique is especially effective when applied to traditional and historical commonplaces. Robert Sherwood managed it with huge success in his play "The Road to Rome." His Carthaginian soldiers talked like American doughboys, and the wife of Fabius Maximus was an advanced feminist. George Bernard Shaw, long before, used the same method of creating humor in "Caesar and Cleopatra" and in "Androcles and the Lion." Public speakers have caught the trick in describing Biblical and classical events. Edward S. Jordan, in his speech "Advertising Automobiles" before the World Motor Transport Congress in Detroit, gives us an unusually happy example:

> When Adam and Eve opened up the Garden of Eden, Adam never dreamed that there was any necessity for advertising, and never conceived of there being any such thing as salesmanship.
>
> He knew he had the only woman in the world, a low overhead and, in fact, everything went along all right until a salesman came along with a red apple and a wonderful selling talk.
>
> Eve fell for that selling talk, and on that day salesmanship and advertising originated. On the same day we had the beginnings of Hart, Schaffner & Marx—now the greatest clothing manufacturers in the world.
>
> When Noah saw the waters rising and conceived the idea of the first great ocean liner, he advertised the fact that he was sorry he could provide accommodations for but two of each of the living species. That's alluring advertising.
>
> I do not know how many extra rooms he had, but the conversation that he gave out has been duplicated by every hotel clerk I ever met in my life. There is always a shortage of rooms in the best hotels. And that's salesmanship.

Upsetting Dignity. A chief source of humor, as may be seen from the foregoing illustrations, is a more active awareness of words themselves. Words have the rigidities of people. They conceal what they would reveal and reveal what they would conceal. They mean much or nothing, and the humorist is alert to the ludicrous ineptitudes of word-

mongery. The easiest way to get a laugh is to upset dignity or complacency. The comedian observes the pride and strut of fine phrases, or the confidence of glib speech, and trips it for a fall.

Francis H. Sisson was asked to make some comment at a New York Luncheon Discussion of the Foreign Policy Association. The subject was: "The War Debts; Status Quo or Revision." Mr. Sisson said:

As the discussion has developed upon this topic of "Status Quo," I am reminded of a story which Irvin Cobb told in one of our evening papers the other day, of a debate held in a certain colored community upon "Status Quo," and somebody finally got up and asked the colored preacher who was presiding just what this status quo was. The gentleman who was presiding over the meeting reflected a few seconds in deep thought and then said, "Well, brudder, status quo is de Latin name for de mess dat we'se all in."

Furthermore, I was reminded by the easy use of facts which preceded me in some of the present discussion, of a story which Premier Hughes of Australia told of Lloyd George, when at a private luncheon here after the war. Premier Hughes was asked, "What sort of a man is this Lloyd George anyway?" He replied, "Well, he is a very able fellow, but he is one of those men who will never stand any damn nonsense from a fact." [Laughter and applause.]

Tu quoque is more interesting to the humorist than *status quo*. Tripping the tripper, "hoist with his own petard," is a game he knows only too well. He lies in wait for the "holier than thou" and flattens him at the climax of his pious condemnation.

In the speech quoted above, Mr. Sisson referred to the international hatred which several speakers had emphasized:

Will Rogers very aptly covered that point the other night in one of his speeches, when some Frenchman called attention to the fact that we were so unpopular in Paris and were hated so generally in Europe, and in his quizzical way Will said, "Well, you don't seem to get on so darn well with your neighbors, yourselves."

National Rigidities. Men and women are everywhere pretty much alike, but they are also different. Racial peculiarities of taste and temperament have always been a source of humor. Every nation has a cus-

tomary point of view, the rigidity and absent-mindedness of which is funny to others. Nations as well as individuals see the parts instead of the whole.

Mr. Sisson continued his speech with an unusually good story to illustrate racial emphasis and preoccupation.

If a group of men of mixed nationalities had gone on a trip to Africa hunting elephants, the Englishman would have called his descriptive story following the trip, just "Shooting Elephants"; the Frenchman would have chosen the theme, "The Romance of Elephant Life"; the German would have called his production, "A Psychological and Pathological Study into the Life of Elephants," in four volumes; the man from Poland might have called his story, "Elephants and the Polish Question," and the Russian would have titled his book, "Are There Such Things as Elephants?" But the American would have written his thesis upon "Bigger and Better Elephants!"

Look around, especially within yourself. Humor implies freedom from cramping obsessions. "Why so hot, little man?" asks Emerson in his playful aloofness. Why so hot about religion, politics, and a thousand other debatable issues? We should have matured opinions, but the man of humor holds his with qualifications. He knows that the absolute truth cannot be had and that his most cherished notions may look ridiculous in a little while.

Playfulness is a conspicuous trait of humor. It is a proof that we are still young in spirit, even though the old bones creak a bit. Our work is serious, but we should take an occasional playful poke at it. In fact, the humorists are often the best efficiency experts. They note the rigidities and suggest the correctives. A laugh may be better than an argument.

Unpredictability is the fascinating quality that grows out of freedom and playfulness. The world is dull because we know just what is going to happen. We know what speakers are going to say. As soon as they open their mouths we know the whole familiar story. The humorist keeps us guessing. We cannot predict just what response he will make to every situation or remark. Because of this uncertainty he surprises and therefore interests audiences. He has the dramatist's knack of sus-

pense. His general conclusions may be conventional, but his imaginative treatment keeps his exposition novel and entertaining.

Sympathy. Bergson's theory of laughter does not speak of sympathy. The philosopher implied that men laugh *at* and not *with* their fellow creatures. But the humorists that move us most have a great pity and tenderness for mankind. They recognize the universal frailty. Their shafts bear less bitterness and more friendly playfulness. "You're comical, old man, but aren't we all?" tempers their hardest sallies. Lincoln, Dickens, Thackeray, Anatole France, have an appeal quite different from that of Swift, Voltaire, and Mencken. The famous satirists and scourges of society are amply justified and rightly exalted, but most of those who would play their role lack the largeness of vision and the mental caliber to warrant a sustained attitude of this sort. They lapse into futility and censoriousness. Faultfinding in itself is not a distinguished trait. The worst rebuke we make to those who indulge too freely in this common dissipation is to say that they lack a sense of humor.

We get many cues from speakers. We see where they get their material for laughs. We study their use of surprise in anticlimax, in beginning with the sublime and closing with the ridiculous, in absurd comparisons, or in exaggeration or the funnier cautious understatement. In the speeches that follow, a simple device for creating humor was characteristic. The speakers selected well-known historical events and matched them with their own comparatively petty experiences during the same periods. Just placing them side by side was often sufficient to get a laugh. The speakers, knowing what they were doing, added a few touches to make the contrast more comical.

But a sense of warm affection and praise was more important. The comic relief was the usual Anglo-Saxon way of keeping the talks from being mushy and emotionally embarrassing. Humor and sentiment are pleasingly combined in these speeches quoted from the *Congressional Record* of Dec. 29, 1920. Two were given in honor of "Uncle Joe" Cannon. The third was Mr. Cannon's response.

MR. CLARK of Missouri: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, a long political career has some disagreeable features in it, as I found out on the 2d day of November. [Laughter.] But it also has some very pleasant ones, and the one that we are about to celebrate today is exceedingly pleasant. To me it is a labor of love.

On this day Mr. Speaker Cannon has served longer in Congress than any other man in the history of the Republic. [Applause.] I doubt exceedingly whether his record will be duplicated in the next hundred and odd years of the Government's existence. When he was 80 years old we went through a magnificent oratorical performance here, with high-class speeches, that I have always called the apotheosis of Uncle Joe. That was a remarkable performance, too.

When Joseph G. Cannon was born on the battle field of Guilford Court House, a victory for Lord Cornwallis, the fruits of which were reaped by Gen. Greene, we did not have any railroads, any telegraphs, any telephones, any sewing machines, any flying machines, and repeating rifles, and a thousand and one things that we consider necessary to our modern civilization. Some newspaper man stated not so long ago that Uncle Joe came into the House in 1863. Of course, that missed the mark by several years. Up until this time Senator Morrill, of Vermont, has held the record for length of congressional service, although to make out his 43 years, 9 months and 25 days you have to add his 12 years in the House to his 31 years, 9 months and 25 days in the Senate.

Missouri was the first state that ever sent a man here for 30 consecutive years to the Senate, and it remains to this day one of the two States that has done that. When Senator Morrill began his thirty-first year I said it was to take the credit away from Missouri. I supposed that was intended to be humorous. Anyhow, today Mr. Speaker Cannon has served 43 years 9 months and 26 days. Senator Morrill died on the twenty-eighth day of December and this is the twenty-ninth.

It is a great honor to the House that Mr. Speaker Cannon has served all of his time in Congress in the House. No man in the House now can expect to serve that long, or ever will, I think. When we celebrated Uncle Joe's eightieth birthday I laid down the conditions on which a man could serve as long as he had. In the first place, the politics of his district must remain the same. In the second place, he must be a man of force and ability. In the third place, he must remain as faithful as the North Star. I said that Uncle Joe

filled those conditions. I think yet that he does. He has lived nearly 85 years; not simply breathed 85 years, but every hour and day that he has been on earth has been active. [Applause.] We all rejoice in the fact that he is still in fine fettle physically and mentally. [Applause.] His strength is not abated. He discharges the duties of a Congressman now as faithfully as any young Member of the House does, and a great deal more faithfully than most of them do. [Laughter and applause.] That is one reason why he has stayed here so long. The principal reason is that with two short seasons of mental aberration his district has remained faithful to him. Twice it did not remain faithful to the Republican Party, but that is neither here nor there.

Getting beat for Congress does not hurt a man who is fit to come to Congress. I think that is an absolute fact. [Applause.] Anyhow, he came back from his first rustication right in the prime of life and went back at the head of the Appropriations Committee and did splendid work. I am certain that I express the hope and wish of every Member of the House that he will live for years to come and stay in the House as a great public institution. [Applause.]

MR. SHERWOOD: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it is true that I am the oldest man who ever served in this historic Chamber, but I have always been told that there is no virtue in being old. [Laughter.] If there were, I would be the most virtuous man here. [Laughter.]

We are here today with a living knockdown argument of the theory of Dr. Osler [laughter] in Uncle Joe, who has honored this Chamber with the longest service of any man who ever served in any parliamentary body in the world. [Applause.] After the magnificent speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rodenberg] so full of historic interest, I hardly feel like saying anything about the career of our distinguished colleague.

I was a Member of the Forty-third Congress. I came into this Chamber as a Representative on the first Monday of December, 1873. We two old chums are the only two men now in public life who were members of that Congress. The only difference between myself and Uncle Joe is that he has been here nearly all the time, and I have been absent nearly all the time. [Laughter.] You may not know it, but I hold also a world's record of being out of Congress for 34 years, and then coming back. That is the world's record for outing. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rodenberg] has referred to the great historical characters of the Forty-third Congress. I remember them well; and

his oration has called to memory the scenes that I witnessed every day on this floor between General Butler, of Massachusetts, who had a seat on the Republican side, and "Sunset" Cox, of New York, a Democrat, who had a seat on this side. General Garfield occupied a third seat from the rear, and back of him was Charley Foster, afterwards governor of Ohio and Secretary of the Treasury; a distinguished Buckeye statesman. I occupied a seat on the Republican side between General Hawley, of Connecticut, and George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts. I was young and green then and did not know any better. [Laughter and applause.]

James G. Blaine, the ablest man of his era, was Speaker of the House. He was his own parliamentarian. We did not have any Hinds' Precedents then. We did not have any Calendar Wednesday. We did not have any Committee on Rules. [Laughter.] We did not have any budget system talk. [Laughter.]

General Grant, then the foremost man of all the world, had just started on his second term, and I remember that the entire appropriation for the White House, salaries, clerks, and everything, was only $42,000. He did not have any military aids. He did not have any bodyguard. I met General Grant time and time again walking all alone on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Speaking of old men, do you know that Pope Leo XIII and John Adams were giving out great ideas at 90? Henry Gassaway Davis, who died a few weeks ago at 93, was looking after his great interest in mines and railroads at 92. George Bancroft, the historian, was writing deathless history at 80. Tennyson wrote his greatest poem, "Crossing the Bar," at 83. Michael Angelo painted the greatest single picture ever painted by mortal man at 80, and was master of the sky and sunshine at 83. Goethe wrote "Faust," the masterpiece of all German literature, at 80. Thomas Jefferson, Talleyrand, Herbert Spencer, and Voltaire were giving out great ideas at 80. Gladstone made the greatest campaign of his entire career at 80, and was master of Great Britain at 83. John Wesley was at the height of his eloquence and power at 88. Humboldt, the greatest scientist and explorer of the German people, submitted the last section of his immortal "Cosmos" at 90. Victor Hugo was at his best from 75 to 80.

Uncle Joe, it is true, has passed the period of adolescence and has reached the age of discretion [laughter] but he has yet years of useful service to his State and country. After the 4th of March next I shall bid farewell to Congress, and Uncle Joe will then be the oldest Member of Congress and the

oldest member of any parliamentary body in the world, and I wish him a parting God bless with all my heart. [Long applause, Members rising.]

MR. CANNON: Mr. Speaker, we have had so many of these wakes [laughter] that I am beginning to wonder if I am not already realizing the hopes of those who desire to return from the other shore and continue to communicate with their friends who are still participating in the ordinary affairs of this mundane sphere. But it is a compliment that I appreciate from my fellow Members of the House, and I thank my personal friend and colleague, the former Speaker, for his sentiments, which I fully reciprocate.

I realize that it is a rather long time that I have been here, but it has not seemed long, for time never drags in the House, and the realization of the years that have come and gone comes to me only when I look into the faces of my colleagues and note the changes.

The year of 1872 was a memorable one in many respects. Vesuvius had a violent eruption that year [laughter] and General Sherwood and I were elected to the House. [Laughter.] There were other happenings—the organization of the German Empire and the French Republic, the emancipation of slaves in Porto Rico, the connection of Australia with the rest of the world by cable, the great Boston fire, and the Geneva award of the Alabama Claims, but these concerned the world at large, while the election of my friend and colleague, General Sherwood, and myself was personal, and I am glad he is here with us to share with me the doubtful honor of elder statesman. [Laughter.]

As I look into your faces I am reminded that our honored Speaker and predecessor in that chair were approaching the polls to cast their first votes that year, Mr. Gillett no doubt voting for General Grant, who had only a few years before been considered a good Democrat, and Mr. Clark voting for Horace Greeley, who was still a stalwart Republican and protectionist [laughter], though translated for a few brief weeks to the leadership of the Democratic Party. [Laughter.]

Jim Mann, at the age of 16, was no doubt beginning his struggle with rival ambitions to continue a farmer or become a lawyer, and I am glad that his perverse nature monopolized his ambitions until today he is an ornament to both professions, a true, scientific farmer and the most industrious and useful lawmaker I have ever known.

My friends Rainey and Mondell, at the age of 12, were beginning to figure

life in percentages, while Rodenberg, at the age of 7, was winning his way with "You would scarce expect one of my age" [laughter], and the ambitions of Claude Kitchin and Nick Longworth, at the age of 3, were centered about their first pants. [Laughter.]

But as I look over the House I find more than 100 of my colleagues who had not then been born; and as I have watched you as you took your places as leaders in committees and on the floor in debate, some of you already called veteran legislators, I feel that 1872 must have been a long way back in the history of the House and the country, for there have been new names added to the United States with a whole great empire covering the plains and the mountains of the West now represented on this floor that were not here then. Eleven States have been admitted to the Union since I first became a Member of the House, and they have often made a noise like a majority here [laughter] and in the Nation and the world, both in peace and in war. [Laughter.]

We have had great development in these years, and I am glad to have been a small part of it and to be able to continue with you in the work we here do for the peace and prosperity of the American people first and the world, so far as we can, by example in fraternity and charity.

I admit that I have been here off and on more years than any of you, but I am not the veteran in continuous service. Gillett, Clark of Missouri, Mann of Illinois, Butler, Greene of Massachusetts, Moon and Sims rank me in that line, because I had two vacations, which I did not seek, and those four years were the longest years that have intervened since I first came to Washington. [Applause.]

I thank you from the bottom of my heart. [Prolonged applause, all of the Members rising.]

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Pretend that your class is having a dinner. Appoint a toastmaster. Have every member of the group give a three-minute talk, the purpose of which is chiefly amusement, entertainment. Personal experiences, good-natured fun poked at the college, at politicians, business, courses of study, radio, movies—anything that looks like a good target will serve. A good story may be sufficient. Try to give it a mock-serious setting, to make an excuse to tell it.

One of the following topics may give you cues or remind you of something better.

1. You Can't Win
2. Sound Effects
3. Medicine Man
4. What I Hear in This Class
5. Gate Crashing
6. Grand Opera
7. Crystal Ball
8. Fuller Brush Man
9. Survey Rackets
10. Emily Post
11. Scotland Yard
12. The Groaner
13. Hedda Hopper
14. Lonely Hearts
15. I Prophesy
16. Farmer's Almanac
17. Truth or Consequences
18. Quiet!
19. Mid-Victorian
20. Natural Gas
21. Allen's Alley
22. Lie Detector
23. Gum Chewers
24. He Died with His Boots On
25. Gabriel Heatter
26. Psychopathic
27. Antiques
28. Back to the Farm
29. Surrealism

30. Mr. Anthony
31. The Assembly Line
32. Astrology
33. Treasure Hunts
34. Arthur Godfrey
35. Trailer Camps

CHAPTER XVIII

COMMON TYPES OF ADDRESS

An old college president who was much in demand as a speaker used to send to inquirers a list of forty-two subjects, below which he added this postscript: "Take any one you want, you get the same speech anyway." The principles and problems of effective composition and presentation are certainly the same for all speeches, no matter how diverse the content may be. But there are several common situations that have developed a few traditional types of more or less conventional procedure. Examination of these will show the student what is appropriate or desirable material for the occasions on which he is likely to be invited to speak. Familiarity with the few proprieties will give him the confidence that comes from definite cues and suggestions. They also involve, unfortunately, a great temptation to be satisfied with a few safe but dull, threadbare phrases. Every occasion, however, is different from every other occasion no matter how great the resemblance, and the difference offers ample opportunity for departure and variety.

The Chairman. The chairman is the director of the meeting. He must know what he is about. He should give a short introductory talk in which he states concisely and interestingly the purpose of the meeting. If it is a convention or an annual meeting he may review briefly important events that have affected the organization in the past year and speak of matters that are to be considered. If it is the usual weekly or monthly meeting and there is nothing in the occasion which calls for preliminary talk, the chairman may proceed at once with the introduction of the speaker.

This type of speech is often a collection of stereotyped phrases beginning with, "We are indeed fortunate in having with us tonight" and closing with, "It gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. . . ."

The chairman can easily avoid this triteness by remembering that it is his business to whet the appetite of the audience, to give it a sense of pleasurable expectancy. This speaker differs from every other speaker and must not be introduced by a blanket formula. His subject and his accomplishments constitute a special appeal to the audience. The chairman may begin by speaking of the timeliness or the novelty of the subject, he may mention an interesting fact about the speaker, he may give a significant incident of his career, he may refer to his own experience with the speaker. He should begin with something specific. Good humor, a good story, and a compliment are certainly appropriate. But all must be sincere. Flattery only embarrasses the speaker and the audience.

At the close of the speech the chairman should thank the speaker before adjourning the meeting. He may speak of the inspiration for renewed effort, of the illuminating analysis, of the eloquent plea. If the speech was poor he can at least refer to a point in the address which had some interest for the audience. It is only common courtesy to thank the speaker for his work and time, even if he was not successful. He should be spared a sense of failure as far as the chairman can honestly and tactfully make it possible.

If there are other speakers on the program the chairman need not thank the speaker but may give a sentence or two of thoughtful and complimentary comment before he introduces the next speaker. The proceedings of many conventions and other gatherings are printed in full, and these bulletins or reports are most practical guides for the student.

The Toastmaster. The toastmaster's duties are, of course, similar to those of the chairman, but as he presides over a festive occasion he has much more opportunity for wit and fancy. How far the toastmaster may proceed with levity and sallies at the expense of the speakers depends upon the intimacy and informality of the group. Among friends and fellow workers he may go as far as good sense and kindliness will permit. When distinguished guests or comparative strangers are being introduced, the presentation must be more dignified and impersonal.

Toastmasters must be careful not to prolong their remarks. Like stage comedians they sometimes continue their fooling or comment too long. Brevity is imperative. When there are several speakers to be heard the toastmaster should do what he can to have the exercises concluded at a reasonable hour. The toastmaster is in charge, and a little thought for the comfort and interest of the audience sometimes goes farther than cleverness of address. Cheerfulness, animation, and brevity will serve very well and often cause the audience to forget the lack of originality or humor.

Speeches of Introduction. Chief Justice Taft once presided at a meeting where a number of distinguished persons were to give five-minute talks. A young man rose to give a few preliminary remarks and rambled on for forty-five minutes. When he finally took his seat Mr. Taft got up and said:

> I remember once when I was in politics, or I thought I was,—one of my friends said I did not know I ever had been in politics,—we had one of these occasions on which there was to be one of these preliminary addresses, and one of these preliminary gentlemen got the platform and held it, but when he finished finally I said, "I will now present Mr. So-and-So, who will give you his address." Mr. So-and-So arose and said, with some apparent heat, "My address is No. blank, 22d Street, New York City, where my train goes in fifteen minutes. Good night."

Strickland W. Gillilan, popular after-dinner speaker, made game of a long-winded toastmaster in this fashion:

> Last year right here in Washington, deceased, I was at a banquet. There were 800 or 900 big, successful business men from all over America present. They had been in convention for four days with three sessions per day, morning, afternoon, and night. They had ended this orgy of conferences, this debauch of meetings, with a banquet at this very hotel, in this very room. They had secured somewhere, I don't know where on earth they found him, a toastmaster. He was a curly wolf for oratory. He put in half an hour at the beginning of this meeting telling these 800 or 900 big, successful business men from all over America, who had been in convention for four days, with three sessions per day, what they were in Washington for! It would have been a

dirty trick if he had let them go back home and never know what they came for. He knew and he was a good sport and he could conceal it from them no longer, so he told them what they were in Washington for.

Having relieved their suspense and satisfied their curiosity on that thing that had been puzzling them all the time they were in Washington, he proceeded to introduce speakers. He would put in 20 minutes introducing a speaker, and, when the speaker got through his few faltering and utterly negligible remarks, this fellow, in words of one syllable, for 15 minutes would explain to the assembled morons what the man meant.

Calvin Coolidge, when he was Governor of Massachusetts, presided at a notable occasion before a huge crowd. He would have been forgiven if he had extended himself a bit. He was characteristically brief, almost austere. He opened the meeting with these words:

We meet here as representatives of a great people to listen to the discussion of a great question by great men. All America has but one desire, the security of peace by facts and by parchment which her brave sons have wrought by the sword. It is a duty we owe alike to the living and the dead.

Fortunate is Massachusetts that she has among her sons two men so eminently trained for the task of our enlightenment, a senior Senator of the Commonwealth and the President of a University established in her Constitution.

Wherever statesmen gather, wherever men love letters, this day's discussion will be read and pondered. Of these men, great in learning and experience, wise in the science and practice of government, the first to address you is a Senator distinguished at home and famous everywhere—Henry Cabot Lodge.

It was not necessary or desirable that the presiding officer comment on Senator Lodge's speech. Governor Coolidge at once introduced the next speaker as follows:

The next to address you is the President of Harvard University—an educator renowned throughout the world, a learned student of statesmanship, endowed with a wisdom which has made him a leader of men, truly a Master of Arts, eminently a Doctor of Laws, a fitting representative of the Massachusetts domain of letters—Abbott Lawrence Lowell.

The following illustrations are quoted from bulletins and journals. They may be improved, but are useful guides from speeches by experienced and capable men.

1. Mr. Congressman Fess, Mr. Ryan, Fellow Members of the Boston City Club, and Guests: We are here on Members' Night, not as at the last meeting of the members at the time of the annual meeting, but on the anniversary, as nearly as possible, of the starting of this Club, which was December 10, 1906. The Club at that time had about 500 members. Today it has 7,500,—7,000 active members, 500 non-resident members, and has a waiting list of just about 500.

We moved into this building, I think, on March 11, 1915. I did not secure the number of members at that time, but our limit was then materially less than at the present time, with its 7,500 members.

We have invested here a million and a quarter of dollars. Our indebtedness today is a mortgage of $275,000, and less than $100,000 of debentures still to be taken up; but this profit, as has well been stated by a former president, is not a profit, properly speaking, in that we have in our 7,000 members just about 2,000 who continue their membership but make no active use of the Club, and that furnishes us with the money which is going each year to reduce our indebtedness. . . .

Our first speaker of the evening has come to us tonight at a great deal of inconvenience to himself. He was asked to come, and felt at the time that it was a question whether, with the incoming of Congress, it would be possible for him to come. He has put other things aside and come to us at great inconvenience, leaving Washington late last night, to be back there again tomorrow morning.

I do not need, in introducing the speaker, to give you much, if anything, with reference to his career. He is not a stranger in Boston. He has been here before. Many of you have heard him, and you will be more than glad to hear him again. Congressman Fess, of Ohio.

2. To be an introducer to a distinguished man, a writer whose views upon a great question of our time, a question of tremendous import to the American people, have affected public opinion, who represents the ideal of attempting to find out what are the essentials of this great question and then to apply them to our twentieth century problems, a man who has looked forward

beyond the bounds of our lives, beyond this century into the future history of the world, striving to discover those causes which have destroyed the nations of the past and to prevent that ruin for our own beloved country, is indeed an honor.

Many years ago I had the pleasure of meeting in his own house the poet John Greenleaf Whittier, and one of the happy moments of that pleasant hour was his recollection of a pleasant hour with another famous poet, Oliver Wendell Holmes. Holmes said, "My friend, I am going on a long journey surely, which looks very dark to me. I do not know where I am going. For all I know, I shall walk into heaven side by side with a Hottentot." "And I said," remarked Whittier, "Friend Oliver, thou shalt find many things in the Celestial City which will astonish thee." And so we shall find many things in the address of the evening which will astonish us. Lothrop Stoddard.

The following is an introductory paragraph of a good address by an inexperienced speaker.

This is the first time I have ever been called upon to address an audience of this kind. I am like a taxi-driver who had driven his car to the depot, and was waiting for a passenger. A little old lady came out of the depot and bustled back and forth very nervously and excitedly and finally came up to the driver and said, "I have always lived in the country and I have never been in a large city and I don't care to go uptown on the streets, but I am afraid to ride in a taxi. Guess I will have to, but be very, very careful because I am so nervous." The driver assisted the old lady into the car and said, "Well, madam, you haven't anything on me—I never drove a car before." So if you are at all nervous about the outcome this afternoon, you haven't anything on me.

Notice the chairman's comment on the speech and his concise introduction of the next speaker.

There wasn't the slightest nervousness in my mind or in the minds of any of us. I am sure that Mr. Garvey, by his human and practical talk, has proven he could carry us to our destination safely and very much better for us. If this is his first talk, I hope that he will come back to us year after year and give us some more facts.

In introducing the next speaker I suppose it's up to me to tell a joke or story, but I am going to be very original and not do it, and simply introduce

Mr. F. E. Searle, Superintendent of Ford Schools, Ford Motor Company, Detroit, who will talk to us on "Some Training Methods in the Ford Plant."

Mr. Searle's opening sentence is:

I am sorry your chairman didn't use one of his jokes—he might have sold a few cars for us.

At the conclusion of Mr. Searle's talk the chairman said:

If I have failed in my natural duty to sell a few Ford cars, I am sure Mr. Searle has not failed in selling his topic.

When we think of developments in the line of constructive work with workers, we think of a great deal that has been done in Rochester, and our next speaker, Mr. Virgil M. Palmer of the Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York, will briefly discuss this subject.

The president of the American Bankers Association opened the convention of 1922 with these words:

We have met here today, gentlemen of the American Bankers Association, in response to the invitation of the bankers of New York. It seems peculiarly fitting that in coming to this city, which was the leader in the movements for financing the World War, and to which city we looked for guidance in surmounting difficulties which at the time seemed insurmountable and also the city which contributed so much of heart and hand toward the relief of distress throughout the world, that the welcome today should be presented to us by a member of the leading firm of international bankers represented in this city, and also the associate of that beloved banker, Henry P. Davison, who gave his life to the country that suffering throughout the world might be relieved. It gives me unusual pleasure to present to you a financier known throughout the land, who will not only welcome us to his city, but also sound the keynote for the deliberations of the convention. I present Thomas W. Lamont of the firm of J. P. Morgan and Company.

Mr. Lamont began as follows:

As chairman of the local Reception Committee and in behalf of New York's bankers and citizens generally, I bid you welcome to this city. We want you to feel that New York City is your city—not for this convention week alone, but for all time. For we would have you believe with us, once

and for all, that New York is not local to the Atlantic seaboard, but is country-wide in its interests, in its achievements, in its attachments. There exists in this country today far too much in the way of sectional feeling—a feeling which if not tempered by a more intimate intercourse and common experience means disunity for our country. To prevent any such unfortunate tendency is the part of all of us.

New York is not made up of a citizenship separated by some mysterious distinction from the rest of the country. On the contrary, it is composed largely of men and women from every locality in the four quarters of America. Except for its size, it might be any other great American city. Broadway is another name for Main Street. Let me tell you in a word how we in New York feel. We feel that we have a share equal with you all in the life and the ambitions of our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have the same satisfactions, the same pride as you in the great manufactures and the wonderful agriculture of the Mississippi Valley, in the cotton fields of the South, in the wheat prairies of the Northwest, in the rugged grandeur of the Rockies and the Sierras, in the fertility, the color, the charm of the Pacific Slope. These great resources, the common inheritance of us all, which your boundless energy and capacity have developed to the benefit of the world, command our admiration and our gratitude.

In the same way do you all share deeply in whatever this City of New York possesses in the way of fine tradition, of character, of enterprise and accomplishment. Whatever it has builded for the stability and security of our country, you have had a share in that building. Whatever it has accomplished in the less material things of life, in music, letters and the arts, to such accomplishment, I say, you have contributed generously and in a portion that could never have been spared. Therefore it is that we would have you feel that New York belongs to the country and the country to New York. Therefore it is that we would have you return here, time after time, members with us of a closely joined family, sympathetic in understanding, close in aspiration, warm in mutual affection.

The Dinner Speech. After-dinner speaking is perhaps the most difficult kind of all. Timeliness and geniality are requisite. Argument, explanation, instruction, are out of place unless they can be given with a sugar coating of harmony and humor. Playful or stirring reminiscence, congratulation, patriotism, inspiring illustration from history and litera-

ture, quicken the sentiment of good fellowship. The suggestion of ease and enjoyment must radiate from the speaker.

It has been often said that the ingredients of after-dinner speaking are the joke, the quotation, and the platitude. The last may be forgotten. It usually appears in spite of the speaker. The common sentiments of generosity and idealism for which one usually builds this kind of speech are platitudes in a fundamental sense, but, as in every speech, the details should be fresh and stimulating. Quotations from poetry are a bit old-fashioned and may sound artificial or too elaborate, but when carried off with abandon and skillful interpretation are still appropriate and effective.

Humor. The joke, the "good" story, is the chief worry and finally the chief contribution of too many speakers. Brander Matthews in his *Notes on Speech Making* says it is significant that after-dinner speaking became popular during the decline of Negro minstrelsy. There is something paltry and almost degrading in the speech that is obviously a string of stories. It violates the spirit of the occasion. The audience craves elevated sentiment, a warm and rich humanity, relaxation, and intimacy. It naturally delights in wit, gaiety, and a light touch but wants them incidental and helpful in the renewing of its faith in the deeper springs of life.

Tell your story by all means, but fit it neatly into the texture of a comparatively serious theme. Make it a step in the expansion of a larger idea. Use it to drive home a moral or to clinch an argument.

If you have no serious theme make your humor more personal and local. Inoffensive sallies at other speakers or at the audience and the occasion, a little burlesquing of your own difficulties, parody and whimsical treatment of public questions or those peculiar to the gathering, often make the body of good talks. This method requires, of course, more originality, study of the situation, and experience, but it scores a correspondingly greater measure of success. Many speeches of this kind contain no stories at all.

There is encouragement for the speaker who lacks these rarer qualities of entertainment in the fact that straightforward speeches on poli-

tics, business, railroads, irrigation, advertising, juvenile courts, and almost every other subject are now commonly heard at dinners. The speech that "went" at a morning session of cotton growers may "go" equally well after dinner. Perhaps the dinners are not so heavy as they used to be. At any rate audiences seem to have a little more room and inclination for mental food. But the old principle still holds good. If you do not wish to look into sleepy faces, entertain your hearers by being vivacious and physically alive. If you can get them genuinely interested in your talk, you need not be a comedian.

The Test of the Humorous Address. Can you be amusing and entertaining without resorting to gags and stories? Not that you should avoid them, but is your humor entirely second hand? The speakers quoted below did not worry about funny stories. They found ample comedy in the situation and the audience. They had zest, wit, irony, philosophy and the unexpectedness and boldness of true personality. They were brief and left the audience wishing for more.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEWSPAPER MEN[1]

Speech of Ulysses S. Grant at the Annual Dinner of the New York Press Club, Jan. 6, 1881

Mr. President, Gentlemen of the New York Press Club: I confess to a little embarrassment this evening in being called upon unexpectedly to say a word to a set of such different men as compose not only the Press Club, but those associated with the Press of the country. I thought this was an evening that I was going to spend where all would be quiet and good order [laughter]; where nobody would have anything to say. We all know the characteristic modesty of the people associated with the Press [laughter], they never want to inquire into anybody's affairs, [laughter], to know where they are going, what they are going to do, what they are going to say when they get there [uproarious laughter]. I really thought that you would excuse me this evening, but I suppose you will expect me to say something about the Press—the Press of New York, the Press of the United States, the Press of the world. It would take a good deal to tell what is possible for the Press to do. I confess that, at some periods of my life when I have read what they had to say

[1] Quoted from "Modern Eloquence," Vol. 2.

about me, I have lost all faith and all hope. [Great laughter.] But since a young editor has spoken of the Press, and has fixed the lifetime, the generation, of newspaper men at about twelve years [laughter], I have a growing hope within me that in the future the Press may be able to do some of the great good which we all admit is possible for it to do. [Laughter.] I have been somewhat of a reader of the newspapers for forty years—I could read very well when I was eight years of age. [Laughter.] It has given me forty years of observation of the Press; and there is one peculiarity that I have observed from reading it, and that is, in all of the walks of life outside of the Press, people have entirely mistaken their profession, their occupation. [Laughter.] I never knew the Mayor of a city, or even a Councilman in any city, any public officer, any government official—I never knew a member of Congress, a Senator or a President of the United States, who could not be enlightened in his duties by the youngest member of the profession. [Great laughter and applause.] I never knew a general of the Army who could begin to do it as well as men far away in their sanctums. [Renewed laughter.] I was very glad to see that the newspaper fraternity were ready to take with perfect confidence any office that might be tendered to them, from President to Mayor [laughter], and I have often been astonished that the citizens have not done so, because all these offices would have been well and properly filled. [Laughter and applause.]

Well, gentlemen, I am very happy to have been here with you, and I hope when a new generation, about twelve years hence, comes on, that I shall see that those of this generation who were so well fitted to fill all the civil offices have all been chosen, and that there will be nothing left for them to criticise. [Peals of laughter.] Thank you, gentlemen. [Great applause, with "Three cheers" for General Grant.]

OUR REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

Speech of John D. Long at the Dinner of the National Druggists' Association, Boston, Aug. 25, 1887[1]

It is very little I can say in response to your toast except to thank you for my seat at your generous board in this goodly company. If the variety from which I have supped is a sample of your wares, than I am sure your drugs

[1] Quoted by permission of Mrs. John D. Long, from "Speeches," by John D. Long.

are very delightful to take; and the price, a few words in the way of a speech, is much more reasonable than your general reputation would lead one to believe. I feel something of kinship with you, when I remember that the ordinary congressman's speech is one of the commonest drugs in the market. But none the less disinterestedly can I testify to the debt which the whole community owe you. Why, sir, more than half the literature and most of the pictorial charm in the daily papers—need I refer to their advertising columns? —are yours. Disinterested and spontaneous lovers of their fellow-men pour their confessions into the public prints so that others may learn, as they have learned, that all the ills to which the human body is heir fly at your approach; that where one spear of hair once grew, there now grow two; that grim dyspepsia is only the dark portal which opens upon the luxurious vista of its cure; and that the kidneys are but a providential agency for tickling the palate with nectars such as were never dreamed of by the gods. You have added a new picturesqueness to nature with the blazonry which your Raphaels and Angelos—Mike Angelos—have daubed on every cliff and rural barn. My earliest instruction in art, when, a boy in Maine, I bought candy in a country store, was to gaze with large eyes upon the illustrated placard which, specked somewhat by the summer flies, but still gaudily picturing the wall, portrayed the glory and beneficence of Townsend's Sarsaparilla. It is said that Daniel Webster took his first lesson in statesmanship from studying the Constitution printed on a cheap pocket-handkerchief. We are like him in this respect, many of us having had our early reading lessons in deciphering the directions, in large type, on the label of Perry Davis' Pain Killer. What brings such sweet somnolence as a drug,—unless it be a sermon? Where else than at the druggist's do you find such a charming and efficient cure for all ills,—except in the solemn platform of a political party convention?

As a Massachusetts man I gladly join in welcoming to Boston you who have come from the cities of the whole country over. There is no extent to which the "Hub" will not go in yielding every courtesy to her sister cities. If she fail at all in that respect, attribute it to her modest reluctance to surpass them in their previous receptions of your association. You have given me rather an indefinite toast, "Our Representatives in Congress." As one of them I am of course your friend, and thank you for calling me so. Why, sir, what Congressman, looking at yet higher honors, would not be the friend of five hundred adults, voters, representing so many States of the Union, each one with a ballot in his hand, each having paid his poll-tax, although at the same

time evading as much of the rest of his tax as he conveniently can? I speak not for myself, but rather for the whole general membership of that distinguished legislative body to which you have referred, when I say that, clumsy, uncertain, and slow as may be the steps of Congress, yet Congress does desire and try, as far as possible, to look after and attend to your business interests and the general interests of the country. I recall the frequent pathetic, if not poetic, picture of dignified and venerable gentlemen, whom in private life you could not touch with a ten-foot pole, if, peradventure, you should ever desire to touch them with a ten-foot pole, who yet, when once elected to service in Washington, become the most servile of errand boys, sweating through the departments to do chores for the people whom they represent and whose suffrages they are willing, not on their own account, but yielding to the demand of their "friends," to retain. You ask, why then does not Congress do something, why not pass this law or that? The answer is, because of the great conflict of interests among you and in the community at large. Congress is only the expression of public sentiment,—nothing more. If that public sentiment is divided, Congress is divided. When that sentiment unites to the extent of a majority sentiment, then Congress enacts its commands. You say you want a bankrupt law and can get none. It is because there is not a sufficient majority of people in favor of it to secure its passage. You have not had, since 1883, a revision of the tariff. It is because public sentiment has not been united enough in demanding it. In other words, it is you, and other associations like yours, who, not as individuals, but as the great business constituencies of the nation, are the real Congress of the United States. The responsibility is yours as well as ours. It is for you to mould the public sentiment and pay the bills; for us to formulate it into law and draw the salary.

In all seriousness, gentlemen, I should not do myself or this occasion justice if I did not speak my word of tribute to the beneficence and importance of your guild. You represent millions of accumulated and invested capital. You employ thousands and thousands of employees. You distribute uncounted wages which is the material bread of life. You turn the wheels of manufactories, and spread the sails, and weight the iron steeds of commerce. . . . Nor do I forget that there is in you something of the Good Samaritan, who poured the oil and wine; and that your work goes to the assuaging of human suffering, the finding of new and more helpful agencies for securing health and repelling disease, and to the holding up of the hands of the physician

and surgeon, whose ministry is akin to that of him who ministers to the sorrows and needs of the human soul. You have the sweetest of all rewards, the consciousness of helping humanity; of somehow, somewhere, making some one happier and better by bringing sleep to a tired eyelid, by bringing rest to an exhausted brain, by bringing quiet to a shattered and tingling nerve, by bringing relief to pain, cure to disease, health to infirmity, and by bringing also, let you and me frankly say, a modest profit in return to your pockets, and now and then a good dinner to a poor but respectable congressman.

The Eulogy. The rule for successful eulogy is: Tell what the man was, rather than what he did. The great stir is in the soul of the man. You cannot interest an audience by giving dates of your hero's birth, marriage, and death or by giving a list of books he wrote or offices he held. The laws he helped to pass and the various useful activities he was engaged in are of slight concern because in themselves they are not specially significant. What were his deeper motives, his handicaps, his failures? What was there in his training, in his conquest of laziness and cowardice, in his growth in patient, generous, royal manhood that can inspire your listeners with renewed faith and energy? The eulogy should confirm our belief that man is better than he seems to be. What he feels is more revealing than what he does.

It is not enough to reiterate with some show of variety that a man was good. We must always come back to the specific picture as the major cause of success. Incidents of his private life, his attitude toward acquaintances and obscure persons, his recreations, his reading, his courage in little things, his habits, the man himself, make up the theme. The stereotyped facts of the man's career are only incidental. The eulogy should marshal the comparatively obscure facts, the incentives and emotions that made them possible.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues: The great State of New Mexico was settled several hundred years ago by the Spanish padres, or Spanish fathers, who located missions, and were followed by the Aztecs of old Mexico, who came up along the water courses, and lighted the torch of civilization and established the Christian religion out beyond where the sun sets. From the loins of that sturdy and hardy stock, my colleagues, sprang Nestor Montoya.

Mr. Speaker, it is only on rare occasions that I attend the funeral of a friend. I prefer to remember the way my friend looked when I last saw him in the full vigor of life and health. But, Mr. Speaker, I was personally and intimately acquainted with Nestor Montoya. For a number of years I ranched in his state. Perhaps I am better acquainted with the Mexican-American, or equally so with him, than most of the men who come to this House. I have been in their homes. I have broken bread with them. I have practiced in the courts of New Mexico, both in the English and the Spanish language.

Nestor Montoya was born 60 years ago in old Albuquerque, now a town of adobe houses across the arroyo from the present beautiful city of that name, out there on the Santa Fe Railroad on the main line to the California coast. There as a boy and young man he met the clod and stubble of adversity such as all had to meet who grew up in that day and time out there almost past the shadow of civilization. He made friends; he exhibited an indomitable spirit from his earliest youth—a determination to surmount obstacles, to achieve success, but never at the cost of his conscience or his principles. And there never was a day in the life of Nestor Montoya that he did not have the confidence of his fellow men. From his early youth and up to the hour of his death he had the confidence, esteem, and good-will of his friends and neighbors and, in fact, the entire citizenship of New Mexico. . . .

He was speaker of the New Mexican Assembly in 1903 and also in 1910. I have had occasion very frequently in legal practice to visit the city of Santa Fe, the capital of the State. And I want to say, my friends, that while Nestor Montoya was speaker of the New Mexico Legislature he presided over that body with fairness and with dignity, and that the speaker's chair was not the harsh bench of the magistrate but rather the woolsack of the chancellor. The minority respected him and admired him because he was fair and just in his rulings and, as my friend from Oklahoma (Mr. Carter) has just said about the frequent exclamations that were heard around his bier, "Este hombre Montoya muy derecho," (Nestor Montoya was a just man and right).

My friends, if you want to get a true insight into the character of a man in his home, in his community, and in his State, go to the plain people—the working class, the laborers, the tender of the flocks, and the cowboy on the range, to the "mozo" and the "pelado," the peasant, the servant. Every one to whom I have ever mentioned the name of my good friend immediately said, "Senor Montoya, muy buen hombre." (Good man.) The plain people understood and loved him because he sympathized with them in their poverty

and their distress, and while he acquired some of this world's goods by hard labor and close attention to his business, not one of these humble people described by my friend from Oklahoma—people clad in Navajo blankets and cowhide sandals—who sought his help and charitable assistance were ever turned away empty-handed. I regret his death, and the people of my home city, who knew him and knew his splendid qualities of heart and mind, likewise deeply regret his passing away.

Mr. Speaker, while Nestor Montoya was a consistent Republican in politics all the days of his life, first and above all he was a true American. He gave two sons and a son-in-law to fight for the liberty of the world and for universal democracy. He gave his money and his time without stint. He was chairman of the defense board of his State and also an earnest worker in the Red Cross Service and all other patriotic activities during the war.

In the death of our colleague, my friends, his State has sustained a serious loss. He always contributed to the material welfare of his people. He stood out for the right and had the confidence and esteem of both political parties in his home State. He wrought well there; he wrought well here. Peace to the soul of Nestor Montoya.

C. B. Hudspeth, *Congressional Record,* March 1, 1923.

The Complimentary Address. Dinners and meetings are frequently held to honor associates and leaders in private or public enterprise. These should not be made embarrassing to the complimented guest. He is not yet dead. The note should not be too personal or extravagant. A review of his achievements is in good taste. Appreciation of his services should be emphasized.

If the gathering is informal and composed chiefly of intimates and acquaintances of the guest, much can be done to soften the blow to the recipient. Sincerity and earnestness should assure him of the hearty good will of those about him, but a little jovial reference to their common experience will reassure him, too. The speaker should not exude a deadly formality or chill gravity to depress everybody. There must be dignity to suggest the importance of the occasion and to give it the symbolism which is necessary to every ceremony, but let it be a cheerful and friendly dignity.

If a gift is to be presented, the address may fittingly close with a brief

reference to it. It is the sign, the token, the expression of the appreciation that has just been stressed and is given with the good wishes of those present. A pleasant bit of advice or comment on it may steady the guest and brace him for his reply.

The Reply. This should be brief. Besides thanking his friends, the speaker should dwell upon his experiences in their common labors. The encouragement and cooperation accorded him, the sense of fellowship, may be mentioned. The narration of one or two significant incidents, a humorous touch, a bit of sentiment, are in order. The conclusion should be as firm as possible and end with an expression of good will and good cheer.

Here is a typical example of a presentation and the response. Both speeches are safely platitudinous and appropriate. The conventional adjectives of praise are somewhat overdone, but the sentiment and the form give practical hints to the inexperienced:

I feel sure that we all will agree that the year just closing has been the most successful in the history of our Association, and the credit is due to the splendid services of our retiring President.

Coming from that splendid state which has contributed so much to our political, social and economic life, it seems he has caught the sunshine of the best traditions of Virginia and spread its glow over our entire Association. His charming personality, his untiring energy, his fairness as a presiding officer, his loyalty to all sections of the Association, his high banking ideals, his broad vision of our domestic problems, and his ability to see and point the way for America to continue to take her high place in the movements of the world, have all contributed to bring this Association up to the highest pinnacle of its achievement.

In bringing the leading bankers of Canada and Great Britain in closer relationship to the American Bankers Association, he has welded more strongly the bonds that bind these two English-speaking peoples together, and if he had done no more than to attract the attention of New York and make this Association once more seem worthy to be guests of this great city, whose hospitality we have recently so much enjoyed, that alone would have put us under everlasting obligations to him.

To be President of this Association is the highest honor which can come

to any banker in this country, and although I see some of the former presidents, I am sure they will all agree with me that the standards of qualification for this office have been steadily raised, and each year it seemed to be more difficult to fulfill them.

I fully realize that the greatest compensation which can come to our retiring President is the knowledge (which I am sure he deserves and must have) that he has the friendship and the goodwill of every member of this Association; that he has contributed to the uplift and upheld the higher ideals of our profession, and that he has contributed in his administration much toward the progress of this country in the affairs of the world.

But we would like him to carry away with him some visible evidence of our appreciation of his splendid services, and I have been requested by the Association to present this silver service, as a token of our regard.

And now, Mr. McAdams, in the name of the American Bankers Association, I present to you this silver service, and may it say to you, your beautiful wife, and your lovely children, as the years go by, "I came from the hearts of the bankers of America, to their beloved President, Thomas B. McAdams, an able banker, a noble patriot, and a Virginia gentleman."

Response

My friends: I had an idea while Mr. Maddox was talking that I should like to tell you a story, but he has been so kind, so effusive in his praise as to put me in no humor for jocularity. This has been a wonderful week. Last year has been a long year. We do not sometimes realize how much work is given to the bankers of America by the officers of the Association. I do not refer to the President, but I speak in behalf of all of those men from the various committees and commissions in the Divisions and in the Sections who voluntarily serve week after week and month after month that at the end of the year there may come this expression through our annual convention of the achievements and purposes of the American banker.

That has been the kind of a year through which we have been, and it has been a great source of satisfaction to me that our response to the hospitality of these noble and lovely people of New York has been so full that we have had this wonderful opportunity to enjoy ourselves in this great city, and at the same time we have shown our appreciation of their desire to make the convention a real one by our attending fully every session of the convention

and of the various Divisions, and through the hundreds who have been turned away because they could not get into the hall, we have definitely answered the criticism which appeared last spring in some of the financial papers that the American banker took no interest in the serious deliberations of his convention, but attended solely for the purpose of having a good time.

If I have accomplished nothing more than to have had something to do with suggesting that this convention be held in New York and making up a program which has brought all of us so close together, then I feel that the time and the labor has been well spent, but far beyond that I do appreciate the cordial cooperation which has been accorded me on every side. I appreciate the warmth of the handshake which I have received in the lobbies during the sessions of the convention; and I shall go back to my home, retiring now again to the routine of banking, with, as Will Rogers said last night, "the work of the world definitely lifted from my shoulders," and live in the memory of your kindness and consideration.

Presenting a gift is a challenge, for some speakers, to find the dramatic symbolism in the watch, gavel, book, or silverware. And there is no doubt that an audience enjoys whatever romantic, poetic, or otherwise stirring implications the speaker may disclose.

The following speech by Caroline Woodruff shows how this love of drama found a perfect situation and had the gift and the speech made to order. This presentation gives some good ideas, however, to those who may not be so fortunate in their materials.

On the front page of an old geography is the picture of a boy standing with outstretched arms looking toward the north pole, and underneath it says, "If you face the north your right hand will point to the east, your left to the west, and south will be behind you." There is a symbolism herein that reminds me of you, Dr. Blair. You stand in your home in Illinois facing north or south—one hand reaching out to grasp the hand of New England, the other the palm of the Pacific, drawing them close together and placing one within the other. You occupy a strategic position in the educational world today, holding together in one the conservative east with the free and boundless west; the chivalrous southland with the frugal, practical north—whichever way you face, your arms outstretched to join the hands of all.

Washington and Vermont are far removed geographically. One with its

nearly 70,000 square miles of territory could swallow in one county the other with its less than 10,000 square miles. One with its 1,350,000 people far outnumbers the other with only 350,000—less in number than those within the walls of the city in which we are gathered. One had its birth less than forty years ago and is today acting as gracious host to this great organization; the other this very year is observing its sesquicentennial with dignity becoming its age. And you, son of the middle west, are the bond today that professionally makes us all one in a common interest—that interest the children of America, east, west, north, south.

It seems to us in Vermont a fitting occasion to show some recognition of the greatest national body of educators known on earth, by the state in which was born the President of the greatest nation on earth. And so today, on its one hundred and fiftieth birthday, the little state which existed as an independent commonwealth for the first fourteen years of its history, the state in which was founded the first normal school in America, at Concord in 1823 —this little state through one of its normal schools today presents you this gavel.

The base is made from wood grown on the site of the old hall in Westminster, where in 1777, Vermont declared her independence through a little group of hardy, intrepid pioneers who had settled in what was then known as New Hampshire Grants. It signifies freedom and self-reliance.

The wood from which the head is made grew on the field of the Battle of Bennington, which took place August 16, 1777, and is considered by historians the turning point of the Revolution. It signifies courage, sagacity, and indomitable will.

The handle signifies authority, leadership, power. It came from a tree still standing on the little Plymouth farm, where fifty-three years ago this very hour on July 4, 1874, Calvin Coolidge first saw the light of day and who, himself, has graciously given the wood to be used for this purpose.

The State Normal Training School at Castleton, Vermont, in presenting this symbol of authority, expresses to you, Dr. Blair, and through you to all this great organization of which you are the chosen leader, the greetings, the love and the loyalty of the Green Mountain State.

The Inspirational Talk. The chief difficulty with this type of address is to keep it sincere and sensible as well as spirited. Salesmen are regu-

larly exhorted to get more business. Pride, courage, ambition, and energy must be stimulated frequently. But this constant urging, especially the repetition of slogans, comparisons, and perfervid optimism, soon loses its effect unless there is genuine sympathy and honest discussion of obstacles and actual business conditions. Concealment, exaggeration, and "bunk" are easily detected by the cynical or discouraged listener. The conventional "ginger" talk is worse than useless. It only induces more pessimism, moroseness, and inaction.

Honesty, tact, and specific facts will move men. Patient but cheerful explanation, constructive suggestion, natural conversational language are far more effective than hectic epigrams or "literary" and colorful effusions. The good story or incident, the stirring appeal, the bit of eloquence that nerves men to a fresh attack are certainly not out of place, but they must be tempered by a sense of reality, of practical helpfulness.

If men are failing because they are loafing, confront them with the disagreeable but compelling facts. Other salesmen in similar circumstances are making better records. Show how they do it. Give ample details about successful methods. Men are sometimes shamed into better action when sentimentality only excites their scorn.

Here is a significant passage from "Succeeding with What You Have," by Charles M. Schwab:

Once when I was with Mr. Carnegie I had a mill manager who was finely educated, thoroughly capable and master of every detail of the business. But he seemed unable to inspire his men to do their best.

"How is it that a man as able as you," I asked him one day, "cannot make this mill turn out what it should?"

"I don't know," he replied; "I have coaxed the men; I have pushed them; I have sworn at them. I have done everything in my power. Yet they will not produce."

It was near the end of the day; in a few minutes the night force would come on duty. I turned to a workman who was standing beside one of the red-mouthed furnaces and asked him for a piece of chalk.

"How many heats has your shift made today?" I queried.

"Six," he replied.

I chalked a big "6" on the floor, and then passed along without another word. When the night shift came in they saw the "six" and asked about it.

"The big boss was in here today," said the day men. "He asked us how many heats we had made, and we told him six. He chalked it down."

The next morning I passed through the same mill. I saw that the "6" had been rubbed out and a big "7" written instead. The night shift had announced itself. That night I went back. The "7" had been erased, and a "10" swaggered in its place. The day force recognized no superiors. Thus a fine competition was started, and it went on until this mill, formerly the poorest producer, was turning out more than any other mill in the plant.

The need of a definite purpose in work is an ancient theme. An efficiency magazine quotes Seneca: "If a man does not know to what port he is steering, no wind is favorable to him." The idea is developed in an inspirational talk:

Efficiency is not hurry and bustle; it is not noise and excitement and ceaseless activity. It is organized, planned action, leisurely done, and with each step marked out in advance. Some men are like tugboats tossed about on the waves, darting here and there, emitting clouds of smoke and making a terrific racket. They seem to be tremendously active. With them, there is "always something doing."

But the tugboat never gets anywhere in particular. For all its strenuousness, it always ties up at the same dock at night.

Other men are like ocean liners—they proceed calmly, quietly, and with no show of effort.

Ocean liners move according to plans laid out months in advance. Their time is scheduled accurately and in detail. They proceed toward a definite port, irrespective of wind or wave. Although they make far less noise, they run more rapidly than the tugboat, and they arrive at their destined port, having sailed every moment according to chart and compass, steering their course by the stars. Let your life·be that of a great liner. Find out where you are going and get there.

So Efficiency means taking your brains and hands, the work you are doing, the way you are living, and so using all of them that you will get more out of them with less work. It teaches you to manage yourself with the same foresight, saving of energy, and acumen as though you were a bank or a factory.

The figure of the ship and the port is one of the most popular with inspirational writers and speakers. Hamilton D. Mabie amplifies it like this:

There are two kinds of men in the world; those who sail and those who drift; those who choose the ports to which they will go, and skillfully and boldly shape their course across the seas with the wind or against it, and those who let winds and tides carry them where they will. The men who sail, in due time, arrive; those who drift often cover greater distances and face far greater perils, but they never make port.

The men who sail know where they want to go and what they want to do; they do not wait on luck or fortune or favorable currents; they depend on themselves and expect no help from circumstances.

No man becomes great by accident. A man gets what he pays for, in character, in work, and in energy. There are few really fine things which he cannot get if he is willing to pay the price. Men fail, as a rule, because they are not willing to pay the price of the things they want. They are not willing to work hard enough, to prepare thoroughly enough, to put themselves heartily into what they are doing.

The only road to advancement is to do your work so well that you are always ahead of the demands of your position. Keep ahead of your work and your work will push your fortunes for you.

Our employers do not decide whether we shall stay where we are or go on and up. We decide that matter ourselves.

The value of time and its systematic and productive expenditure are naturally ever pertinent and practical themes. A great cash register company quotes Arnold Bennett in "How to Live on Twenty-four Hours a Day."

The supply of time is truly a daily miracle, an affair genuinely astonishing when it is examined. You wake up in the morning, and lo! your purse is magically filled with twenty-four hours of the unmanufactured tissue of the universe of your life. It is yours. It is the most precious of possessions. No one can take it from you. It is unstealable, and no one receives either more or less than you receive. Talk about an ideal democracy. In the realm of time there is no aristocracy of wealth and no aristocracy of intellect. Genius is not rewarded by even an extra hour a day.

Persistency is a staple subject for the speech of inspiration. The analogy, the striking comparison, heats and sharpens this idea as surely as it quickens the meaning of purpose and economy. A house organ gives us this:

A bar of steel weighing half a ton was suspended vertically by a small chain. Nearby, a cork from a bottle was suspended by a silk thread. The cork was started swinging so that it struck gently against the steel bar. Of course, it made no impression on the bar. But the motion of the cork was continued and at regular intervals it struck the great bar in exactly the same place. Five minutes passed, and still no effect was noted on the bar. After ten minutes the bar gave evidence of feeling uncomfortable. A sort of nervous chill crept over it. At the end of twenty minutes the great bar was swinging like a pendulum of a clock.

Many, many times, it is said, in effect, "Well, I've tried advertising and it did not produce results. I ran a two-column, four-inch ad every week for six weeks in the *Gazette* and got no return from it."

We never question that statement—we only question the good judgment of a man who tries to do the impossible and complains that his tools were no good. We only question the good sense of a man who says, "I'll take one dose of this medicine and if I don't feel better right away the doctor is a dumb-bell and his medicine a fake."

One bath doesn't keep you clean for life—you have to keep at it. One punch didn't knock Carpentier down—Dempsey kept at it. One shot didn't win the war—the boys kept at it. One ad—or one month's ads—won't bring the business—you've got to keep at it.

The public does not want to remember—you must make them. The public mind is the bar of steel—a dead weight. Your advertising is the little, tiny cork, but if you keep your cork swinging on that mass of steel it will swing—your way.

Summary. Perhaps this is as good a place as any to stop calling the roll of speeches. What you have just read may have inspired you to rely on yourself, to realize that you are a leader as well as a follower, that you will give the speech as your sense and experience dictate, call it what you will.

Classifications are in large part artificial, but writers of textbooks

still like to make them. They will tell you about the speech to inform, the speech to explain, the speech to convince, the speech to persuade, the speech to stimulate, the speech to entertain, the speech of courtesy, the speech of good will. These distinctions have differences, to be sure. They remind you to get a definite purpose to motivate your talk, but they are misleading if they tempt you to work by pattern or formula. Your speech is you, and you are different from everybody else. Your speech has a life of its own and cannot be confined to a category. It reaches out for anything that will keep it alive. It may wish to convince, but it still must be courteous, get good will; it must inform, explain, stimulate, persuade, and entertain by being interesting.

So the chapter ends as it began, by repeating that the principles of good talk are the same for all speeches. Think of every talk in terms of the occasion, the time at your disposal, your purpose, your subject. Think of the experience, the mood, the probable wants of your audience.

Listening to speakers at various occasions, or reading their speeches, will give you a surer confidence in your own taste and judgment. You need that experience before you dare trust yourself with fresher, less obvious materials and presentation.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Appoint a toastmaster and a committee of arrangements for an actual or imagined dinner at least two weeks distant. The committee may select the speakers and assign or approve the toasts or subjects. Outlines of the speeches should be submitted to the instructor before the dinner. The toastmaster may inject a little humor, reality, and responsibility into the occasion by introducing the speakers as authorities in the subjects to be discussed; as Frank Vanderlip Robinson, former President of the National City Bank; Edwin Curtis Brown, Chief of Police; Payson Smith Jones, Commissioner of Education.

The occasion should be as definite as possible. It may be the annual class dinner, a gathering of department-store employees, the monthly luncheon of the Foreign Trade Club or of the Amalgamated Advertisers.

II. Hold a convention and appoint a chairman and committee of arrangements as before. Have one student act as the mayor or some other city official to welcome the visitors, who may be The New England Hardware Dealers, the Cotton Growers Union, the Western Commercial Teachers' Association, the Industrial Engineers of America, or any other organization that the class may decide to be. A study of convention bulletins and reports will give many good suggestions for a varied and lively program. Have inspirational and humorous speakers as well as the usual successful businessmen.

III. Have a meeting to present a gift to the college or to a student. It may be a picture, loving cup, medal, or book. The chairman should explain briefly the purpose of the meeting and introduce the student who is to make the presentation. Someone should make the response for the college.

IV. Hold a mass meeting to urge students to support the team by contributions and attendance at the games.

V. Conduct an election of officers for the class or the club. Have at least two nominating speeches made for each office.

VI. Give a dinner in honor of the football team. Assign speeches for the President or Dean, one or two of the faculty, prominent students, the coach, and members of the team.

VII. Give a dinner to Phi Beta Kappa students or others of scholastic achievement.

VIII. Prepare and deliver speeches for a "smoker" given by the sophomore class to the freshmen.

IX. Conduct the regular weekly or monthly assembly. Assign a student to act as chairman, another to read a passage from the Bible, another to represent a visiting college president who is to speak, or a prominent businessman.

Appoint others to make announcements and to give other talks that are common to your assemblies.

X. Pair off the students, one to make the introduction, the other to give the address. Reverse the order at a later meeting. The subjects may be of an inspirational nature or topics of popular interest. Get attractive titles. An outline and a copy of the speech should be given the instructor before presentation.

XI. Conduct a class reunion. Imagine that the class is meeting twenty years after graduation. Appoint a toastmaster and a committee to make the necessary arrangements. Let them appoint at least six speakers and confer with them in regard to subjects. The toastmaster should give a brief preliminary talk, humorous, philosophical, or reminiscent. He should know enough of the history and the subject of each speaker to introduce him appropriately and entertainingly. If there is time left, he may call upon other students for impromptu talks. The wise student will not be caught quite impromptu. He will have a story, an anecdote, or a witticism.

XII. Elect a president, senator, governor, or mayor. All parties may be represented. Let each student give the instructor a slip of paper with his name and that of his candidate written on it. The instructor may then assign nominating addresses and speeches seconding the nominations. After all the nominations have been made for one office, the elections should be held.

XIII. Imagine that a popular employee is resigning his position after several years of excellent service. You are to present him a watch in behalf of his fellow workers.

XIV. Let another student receive the gift and make the reply.

XV. Tell a "funny" story. Give it a setting and introduce it as naturally as possible. Make it illustrate some general idea like laziness, speed, timidity, disgust, worry, confidence, aloofness, etc.

XVI. Which story told before the class is most useful to the public speaker? Give your reasons.

XVII. Speak on one of the following subjects:

1. The Simple Life Is Too Expensive
2. The Royal Family
3. National Blood Program
4. Henry A. Wallace
5. Chain Stores
6. Mail-order Business
7. The Team

8. Forty Hours a Week
9. Imitation Furs
10. Opportunities in the South
11. Smugglers
12. Summer Job
13. Stocks and Bonds
14. In the Factory
15. What the Church Can Do
16. Taxi
17. Bus Driver
18. I Go Fishing
19. Glass Houses
20. Mental Telepathy
21. Spiritualism
22. Playing a Hunch
23. Knock on Wood
24. Gypsies
25. Mountain Climbing
26. Graft in Cities
27. Communism in the United States
28. This Morning's Paper
29. Air Conditioning
30. Criminals at Large
31. Wall Street
32. John L. Lewis
33. Jet Propulsion
34. Radar
35. The American Legion
36. The Argentine
37. Brazil
38. If I Had the Money
39. The Training of Nurses
40. First Aid

CHAPTER XIX

RADIO SPEAKING

President Roosevelt gave you the fireside chats. He saw you in your home at the radio and talked to the family. Millions were listening but not in packed halls. Conversation was the cue, not public speaking.

You see the difference—an intimate personal style, friendly and spontaneous. You are listening to a visitor of good but comfortable manners, who captures you with his light but stimulating comments on topics of general interest.

It sounds enticing—and what a relief to get off the platform. Radio directors have their doubts, however. Unless you are a big name they are sure everybody is dialing you out for a jazz band, drama, or comic. Radio speeches rate pretty low in their book. The speakers just don't know how to make their stuff interesting. They may not be much worse than platform speakers, but they have to compete for attention on the air, and few are successful, though many are respectable.

The Radio Paradox. Radio speaking is easier and harder than platform speaking. It is easier because you have all the words set down before you. You have no fear of stumbling or forgetting or failing to find the right word or sequence of thought as in extemporaneous speaking. Little physical energy is required. No style in bearing, manner, posture, is necessary. You may sit down, if you wish, in your shirt sleeves, and with your collar unbuttoned. Your audience can't see you.

But radio speaking is also harder because it requires you to be something of a writer and something of an actor. The script must be carefully written out. It must sound like talk and yet not be as loose and rambling as ordinary talk. Everything should be natural and yet concentrated and progressive.

Preparing the Script. Before you begin writing ask yourself what

you want this audience to feel, think, believe, or do. What definite response do you wish to win? Why should the audience be interested in your subject? What do people already know about it? If they know considerable, what is your excuse for bringing it up again? To induce your listeners to give more money? To show them they are overlooking something important to their welfare? To request that they vote or act for some person or measure? Don't write merely to fill space and time. Find the moving purpose that will unify and vitalize your script.

Appeal to the basic wants—health, jobs, security, money, prestige, the desire to get ahead and be somebody. Talk of comfort, pleasure, entertainment. Stimulate their courage, generosity, loyalty, or self-respect. Not all these approaches and attacks are needed or practical, but one or more should give you the cues for the development of your speech.

Remember that your invisible audience is more interested in people than in things; in moving pictures more than in stills, in anecdote, story, dramatic touches, a bit of humor. It will listen to serious talk, but it soon gets impatient with abstractions and generalities. It will turn that knob in a minute if you don't get to "For instance," "Here's the situation," or "What do you think of this?"

Think of yourself as a salesman with an alert, vigorous, interesting presentation of a useful idea or product. Keep your sentences short, your words simple and specific. Make your opening remarks suggest something good to follow. Remember the dramatic technique of challenge, conflict, suspense, variety, and color, and you can't go far wrong in the writing of a live script.

Length of the Script. Here are a few paragraphs of directions quoted from Hoffman and Roger's "Effective Radio Speaking.[1]

You have to fit your material almost exactly into a given time scheme. If you are on a fifteen-minute program your talk should take about 11½ minutes to read at a moderately paced, conversational gait. Time must be allowed for the announcer to introduce you, as well as to make his closing remarks.

[1] McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1944.

When you have completed the writing of your speech, read it aloud and have a member of the family check the time carefully. Have you got to add paragraphs or take them out? Use all your available time, if possible. The announcer, or director, can if necessary, fill in time left over, by playing a record, but that is always a sign of poor management, and the studio would prefer not to be put to that confession.

On the other hand, if your talk is too long you may be cut off in the middle of a sentence. Time on the air is scheduled by seconds, and you are not allowed to take the time of another program. It often happens that a speech may be several paragraphs too long even when it has been carefully timed in rehearsal. The speaker may unintentionally change his rate of speed, speak more carefully, more slowly, and so not finish in time.

For this emergency he should always have at least two short paragraphs, near the end of his talk, that he could leave out without violating the clearness or continuity of his talk. When he gets to his last page, he should look up at the director to see whether he is giving the sign to cut. He does this by drawing a finger across his throat. That is the cue to skip a few lines and conclude promptly.

It sounds troublesome but it really isn't. If you have taken reasonable precautions, the announcer can handle the situation comfortably. He has a few seconds of latitude. He can speed up his own reading a bit, or slow down a little, to close neatly at the right moment. . . .

When you don't need to cut, you may still need a "cushion," that is, an additional paragraph or two which you should always have in reserve in case your material doesn't fill the required time.

Your manuscript should, of course, be neatly typed in double space. You should not handicap yourself with penmanship or type that is not easy to read. Some speakers time themselves very carefully and note in the margin at the bottom of each page the minutes and seconds consumed up to that point. With this precaution they can know, when they are on the air, how closely they are observing the determined rate of speaking.

How to Read the Script. Read cheerfully and informally. To read as if you were just chatting is not easy for most speakers. They fail in what actors and radio people call timing, that is, they do not imitate "first-time utterance" well. They do not give the characteristic pauses and groupings of extemporaneous talk. They read too regularly. The

words on the paper just pull them along at a monotonous and usually too fast a rate. In public speaking words don't always come readily and you are warned against the annoying habit of filling in pauses with *uh's, er's, well's* and *why's*. It may help you in radio reading to deliberately put in one or two to give the suggestion of unpremeditated, spontaneous talk.

At any rate, follow the practice of professional radio speakers. Put vertical lines on your script at natural and dramatic pauses. This marking off of the phrase units will slow you down and remind you of the necessary stops. The conventional punctuation marks are not enough. Here is a sentence, for instance, from a speech by Franklin D. Roosevelt. There is no punctuation to guide you, but you would space it and "time" it somewhat like this:

> Today/so many thousands of welcome telegrams/and postcards/and letters of birthday greetings/have poured in on me/in the White House/that I want to take this opportunity/of thanking all of you/who have sent them.

This timing corresponds roughly to your breathing and makes your speaking more comfortable, confident, and poised, besides making your talk clearer and easier for audience comprehension.

Stress. Another matter to indicate on your paper is the stress or attack on key words. Underline the words that should be given with added force. The complete markings for the sentence of Roosevelt's might be as follows:

> Today/so many thousands of welcome telegrams/and postcards/and letters of birthday greetings/have poured in on me/in the White House/that I want to take this opportunity/of thanking all of you/who have sent them.

With practice, experience, and confidence, much of this may be unnecessary, and even distracting, to the sure reader. But there may be always occasion, especially in longer sentences to mark off pauses for breathing.

Pitch Level. Get your voice "out of the mud," as radio men call it. Don't keep your voice on such a low level that it sounds like laborious, monotonous pushing through sludge. Speak in the comfortable mid-

dle register, so that your inflection can go easily up or down. Change of pitch level calls attention to transitions, new paragraphs, and ideas.

Practice. Reading your script aloud several times gives you the tune, the melody, of the script. Even if you are somewhat nervous at the microphone, you will still follow pretty closely the remembered rate, stress, pitch, and inflection.

At the Studio. Get to the studio fifteen or twenty minutes early. Look around, get acquainted with your surroundings, and relax. The director will take care of you, show you where to stand or sit, and tell you to talk about 8 or 10 inches away from the microphone. He'll ask you to take the clip off your manuscript and drop each page, when read, on the table or the floor to avoid rattle, which may sound very noisy on the air. Perhaps he will ask you to read a paragraph before the broadcast to allow the control-room engineer to get your voice level and place you better before the microphone. Don't wait for others to remind you to get a drink of water to avoid clearing your throat at the last moment.

Mike Fright. It is almost time to begin the broadcast and you feel a bit queasy. That is normal. Every strange experience, every new job, is likely to make one self-conscious with a feeling of inadequacy. And the metal disk seems dead. It gives no response. You can't see any cordial faces, and every remark seems to fall flat.

But the old-timers in radio will tell you that it's a lot easier than platform speaking. Nothing to memorize, no worry about forgetting! All the words are in front of you, and they don't have to be spoken with the volume and energy of the public speaker. Just read as if you were talking to a friend, not to a million strangers, and don't take your eyes off the script. It isn't necessary, and you may lose your place.

On the Air. When you get the signal to begin, take your time with that first sentence. Don't speak loud or abruptly. Don't blast the tubes with sudden volume and jerky utterance. Continue to see that interested face at home or next door, and talk with your usual animated ease. Use your hands, gesture, smile, do anything that will encourage you to sound as if you were talking, not reading.

When you get near the end of your script, look up at the director. He may be signaling to cut, or he may be going through a pulling or stretching motion with his hands to signal that you are finishing too soon, so that you should read slower and continue with extra paragraphs, if you have written a "cushion."

The Playback. Perhaps a record was made of your broadcast. Ask to have it played back to you. You will learn more about your voice from that than from any critic or teacher. You may hear yourself "taking in" air, giving indistinct articulation, incorrect pronunciation. You may notice that you are talking too fast, that you are monotonous and have little life, or you may be surprised to find that you were better than you thought.

Rate of Speaking. President Roosevelt spoke at a rate of 130 to 140 words a minute—a deliberate to moderate rate that is usually most effective. Radio actors naturally use faster or slower rates, depending on the mood they are reflecting. Comedy sometimes requires a faster rate, sorrow a slower.

Variety. Practice for sufficiently wide inflections. Don't be a "Johnny-one-note" and don't be a "mudder," one who is stuck in a bassy, unpleasant, throaty voice and won't practice on a somewhat higher level.

Read a variety of selections to your classmates or to members of your family. Be agile, flexible in mood, rate, force. Notice how announcers keep in harmony with the programs they are introducing. Listen to commentators and lecturers, make specific comments on their voices, and try to discover why you like some better than others. The first step in improving your own skill is to be aware of differences in articulation, resonance, timing, stress, pitch, and inflection. You learn the tunes by ear.

Television Speaking. This topic need not detain you long, when you know how to write and read a script for radio. You are still speaking to the family circle, even though you appear in a crowded tavern. There are, of course, one or two differences to consider. You will be seen as well as heard. That means that you must dress and look as you would before the visible audience. Another thing follows—important

but not difficult. You've got to talk to people with your face and body.

When you are not seen, you may keep your eye exclusively on the script, but in television you will have to look up as much as possible, just as you would if you were reading your speech at a convention or other meeting. Your eyes and face must be expressive, your body alive.

If you are televised in a hall while addressing an audience, just pay attention to the people before you as in the usual public-speaking situation. If you speak from a television studio, you must look up and speak up as if you saw the listeners in front of you.

The studios will expect actors to speak without script. That means memorizing, rehearsing, and dressing the parts of a play. The easy days of radio actors will be over. Perhaps directors will also request the occasional speaker from business and other occupations to give a memorized speech. They may not dare ask for an extemporaneous speech. That would be the top performance, actually talking with the invisible audience. Don't give it a thought unless you are really ambitious. William Jennings Bryan tried it in the early days of radio but gave it up in the middle of his first speech. He apologized to his audience and said he couldn't think because he couldn't see them. Pretty good evidence that public speaking is two-way talk. At any rate, today radio takes no chances without script, and it is probable that television will follow much the same custom in the matter of speeches.

Study the Following Speeches. Notice how Mr. Bowles builds up attention and persuades us to give. He compares the hungry child overseas with your child or little brother or sister. He emphasizes the enormous problem of relief for starving children. He describes the origin of one attractive plan and shows how it is working and how you can help, with no great sacrifice, to make it a wonderful gift of life and hope. He closes with a contrast of cheerful light and ominous dark. He warns that we all had better give for the sake of our own children.

When you have read Mr. Bowles's serious plea, made eloquent by effective comparison and contrast and convincing by statements of practical detail, read the few paragraphs quoted from Mr. Schoenbrun's talk. Examine the differences in style. Mr. Schoenbrun had a different

purpose. It was chiefly to entertain by stories and anecdotes that showed how different are the customs and living conditions in Europe. His secondary purpose was to remind us of our blessings and to hint that we don't appreciate them.

Mr. Schoenbrun's style is more colloquial and playful. He keeps his material alive by a run of moving pictures. We see the steamer, sheets and pillowcases, hot water, fresh fruit, and the orange which is the cue for an amusing commentary on politics and black markets.

See how much interest the speaker gets out of a list of commonplace things just before the close of his talk. But put where they are, they hit us hard and at the same time give Mr. Schoenbrun the opening for that neat smack in his final sentence. The ending is swift, surprising, emphatic. We feel like calling, "Just a minute, mister."

Go back over the script and look at the choice of words—"Oh, I've eaten oranges," "I've got a source, old man," "It's nice to be home again," "Yes, it's really good to be home," "What I can't figure out." Dialogue and the impulsive phrases of the street, office, and home, make the script compelling. Here's a chap who can really talk at a typewriter and make you believe he has just breezed in to say, "Hi there, America!"

GIVE ONE DAY

By Chester Bowles, Chairman, International Advisory Committee for the United Nations Appeal for Children, broadcast over CBS, Nov. 5, 1947

In the entire world, one-half of all the children are in critical need of food. This means about 460 million infants and children under 15. When I say these children are hungry—I don't mean that they have the normal hunger of a child who wants a snack before bedtime, or when he comes in from play. These children need more food so desperately that many of them will not live without it.

Much is being done, in familiar and established ways, to help these children. This, however, is not nearly enough. In spite of all the efforts of our governments and private relief agencies, there are—right now—at least 230

million children living on the very border of starvation. They depend totally upon us—and let us never forget that. Each one is an individual, not unlike your own, a child crying for the right to grow up and live.

The United Nations Appeal for Children is asking the people of every nation to Give One Day—for the World's Children. This slogan came directly from a great self-help campaign in Norway, immediately after the war. It was proposed to the United Nations by Mr. Aake Ording, Norwegian delegate, and the Appeal was established by resolutions of the General Assembly and the Economics and Social Council.

Under Mr. Ording's direction, five field offices have already been established, to cover the entire earth—in London, Prague, Cairo, Shanghai and Lake Success in New York. These field offices will help establish a national committee in every country. We must not be content with gifts from a few wealthy individuals. The slogan, Give One Day, will have a different meaning for different groups. Businessmen may give a day's profits; workers in factories and offices, a day's pay; farmers, the value of a day's produce.

What would such a contribution cost for the 230 million children who are really in desperate need? For six months, the cost would be nearly 1½ billion dollars. It is easy enough to say that this is an enormous figure and to be frightened by it, but let's remember that the Allies spent one-fourth of this amount every day, during nearly 2 thousand days of World War II for war materials alone—in a war that we all agreed was fought for peace and freedom and a decent existence. In other words, just to keep life and a minimum of health in these 230 million little bodies, we are asked to spend less than the cost of 4 days of war. If we will actually give one day—this figure will be met.

In a little while, if yours is a typical American home, your children will be going to bed. For the most part, they will sleep soundly, and wake up to eat hearty breakfasts before they go to school, or go out to play. Perhaps one of them will cry out tonight, because he is afraid of the dark, or because he has a nightmare. You will turn on the light, and quickly comfort your child. The 230 million children for whom I speak are all crying in a world that, for them, is very dark. Their nightmare is the bitter reality of their daily lives. All of us together have the power to turn on the light for them. If we fail to use that power, there can be no lasting peace for us—and none for our own children.

AN ORANGE

By David Schoenbrun, CBS correspondent in Paris, broadcast upon his return to this country, Sept. 24, 1947

When I boarded the French Line steamer in Le Havre, I was technically in France, but when I saw the snow-white pillow cases and sheets on my bed; turned the tap marked "hot water" and almost burned my hand; saw what seemed to be a bowl of fresh fruit on a night table—then I knew that I had left France and was home again.

It was the orange that really got me. Oh, I've eaten oranges in Europe. In the four years I've been away from home I must have eaten as many as a dozen, and each was a major event. But oranges are political in post-war Europe. I learned that early. The act of eating an orange or offering one to a guest can be packed with dynamite.

The first thing that happens is that your guest, a Frenchman, a Czech, or a Greek, gasps unbelievingly and says: "An orange! God, where did you get it?" You smile, probably wink an eye, and say: "I've got a source, old man!" Your friend reaches for the precious fruit, examines it fondly, and then he puts it in his pocket. It seems that he has a three-year-old son who has only eaten two oranges in his life. Or, perhaps, your friend will eat the orange in your house; maybe he doesn't have a son. And then, inevitably, he'll ask: "Is that orange from North Africa or from Spain?" You know, it's nice to be home again, where oranges just come from Florida or California and have no political coloration.

In Paris, for example, an orange can come from Algeria or Morocco or Spain, and no matter where it comes from it's politically or morally a bad orange, according to most Frenchmen. It took a long time for me to get used to the idea that oranges can be reactionary and immoral. It's going to take me a long time to get used to the idea that if I want to eat an orange now, why, all I have to do is go out and buy one. I don't have to worry here about whether it was smuggled across the border from Spain. I don't have to worry about the fact that it might be a North African orange, stolen from government supplies destined for children and sold to me by a black market operator. I have no wrestling date with my conscience. I'm back home, and I can eat an orange any time I like. . . .

It's a strange experience to leave the land of the have-nots and come back to the home of the haves. My first night in New York, I was surprised to see

a store selling cigarettes. Not that I didn't know that cigarettes are sold in stores in America, but for four years I haven't bought a pack of cigarettes in a store. I import them from America, pay a customs duty of 70¢ a pack, and when a shipment is late, I buy them from a hotel porter for $1.50. The porter buys them from a soldier for 75¢. I've been home now almost a week, but I still can't pass a cigar store without wanting to rush in and buy ten cartons all at once.

I had a wonderful time yesterday afternoon. I went to my hotel room, stretched out on the bed and called Room Service. I ordered an ice cream soda. Then I called the valet and asked him to press my suit. Then I asked a bellboy to buy all the afternoon papers and national magazines. I had my shoes shined; I bought talcum powder and hair tonic, and I had a hot bath and then I had a shower. Almost any of these simple pleasures would have taken one day to three weeks to obtain in Europe and would involve breaking at least three municipal and two national laws.

Yes, it's really good to be home. What I can't figure out is why everybody I've seen back home is so unhappy.

ASSIGNMENTS

I. Write a short talk for radio on one of the following subjects, or something else that may occur to you as more congenial. Read it to the class from behind a screen or door. If this is not practicable, go to the instructor's chair and place a book up-ended in front of you on the desk. It may suggest the microphone. Read without looking up, but be sure you can be heard in the back of the room. Of course, if you have a radio studio, use it and be as professional as possible.

1. The ABC of Vitamins
2. DDT
3. A Good Insurance Policy
4. Permanent Wave
5. New Fashions
6. What's 1,500 Calories?
7. Slot Machine
8. The School Paper
9. Youth Hostels
10. Liquor Control
11. The Pacific Northwest
12. New England Is Still on the Map
13. Fast Readers Are Better Readers
14. New Highways
15. The Illusions of Seeing
16. Missionaries for Democracy
17. Used Car
18. Political Conventions
19. Flower Shop
20. Ivory Tower
21. People Are Funny
22. Baby Sitter
23. Korea
24. Japan
25. A Legendary Figure
26. Speaking of Pictures
27. Hot Dog!
28. Forest Fires
29. The Picket Line
30. I Would Like to Buy a Home

II. The instructor may appoint committees to prepare several types of radio programs. It is easy to imitate and parody some of the popular broadcasts. The surest way to develop showmanship on the air is to write and read the announcer's opening and closing remarks, the "commercials," interviews, comments by commentators, forums, symposiums, short plays, and other types of radio programs. These suggestions may help:

1. Local Reporter Interviews Visiting Movie Star
2. Washington Correspondent Interviews Politician
3. A Labor-management Round Table
4. A Round Table on a University of Chicago Round Table
5. Sports Round-up
6. Farm Market Facts
7. Weather Forecast
8. Breakfast Club
9. Adventures of the Fat Man
10. Chan's Chatter
11. Gertie's Gossip
12. Home Forum
13. Food Fair
14. Going Shopping
15. The Business Barometer
16. Walter Winchell
17. Drew Pearson
18. Lowell Thomas
19. Queen for a Day
20. Can You Top This?
21. Sidewalk Interview
22. What's Your Problem?
23. College Capers
24. Around the World
25. Names in the News
26. UN Today
27. Round the Town
28. Regarding Russia
29. Rendezvous
30. Invitation to Learning

INDEX

D

E

F